

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5820. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name or character "Smokey Bear"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5821. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to insure that materials and equipment needed to complete construction of schools and hospitals and churches programed before September 8, 1950, are made available for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5822. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 5823. A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5824. A bill to provide for reductions in appropriations made during the present Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 5825. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 5826. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the substitution, for draw-back purposes, of box shoo; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 5827. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers and enlisted persons of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5828. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of (1) the original taxpayer, or (2) a wholesale fermented malt liquors dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5829. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 5830. A bill to provide a new method for the appointment of Members of the House of Representatives to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5831. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5832. A bill to amend the definition of parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Revision of Internal Revenue Laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution calling for the dismissal of J. Howard McGrath as Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 472. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation regarding hospitalization, medical and surgical care of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 473. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 472; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to authorize the United States Corps of Engineers to make a survey of the headwaters of the Warrior River and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 471. Relating to allocations of materials for schools and hospitals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5833. A bill for the relief of Carolina Montini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5834. A bill for the relief of Arnaldo Senese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5835. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Doryzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5836. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5837. A bill to incorporate the Future Homemakers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 5838. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Coolidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 5839. A bill for the relief of Arnold Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 5840. A bill for the relief of sureties in certain immigration cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5841. A bill for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co.; Roy L. Bair & Co. and James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; and T. E. Connolly, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 5842. A bill for the relief of Fajwel Goldblat (also known as Felix Fibich) and Judith Goldblat (also known as Judith Berg Fibich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 5843. A bill for the relief of Shizue Sai and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5844. A bill for the relief of Robert Vernon Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 5845. A bill for the relief of Michael Osamu Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

480. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of Rev. Clyde W. Coleman, pastor of the South Flores Baptist Church, of San Antonio, Tex., and 49 others; petition of Rev. Elvius Pepper, pastor of the Mitchell Terrace Baptist Church, of San Antonio, and 17 others; and petition of Rev. Dick Scott, pastor of Black Creek Baptist Church, of Devine, Tex., and 42 others, with reference to existing conditions in Army camps and in cities where Army camps are located, with reference to

the sale of intoxicating liquor on military reservations, and placing taverns and tap-rooms "off limits," and making it a Federal offense to sell intoxicating liquors to anyone in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

481. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Alletta L. Dillon, of Cedar Falls, and 50 other residents of Iowa, in support of bills H. R. 2187, 2188, 1749, 3494, 3263 and in opposition to bills H. R. 264, 3073, 3235, 1206, 1736, 2982, and 3624; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

482. By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Resolution passed by the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., urging that the Government of the United States acquire and maintain as a patriotic shrine the land at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets in the city of Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was drafted and prepared; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

483. By the SPEAKER: Petition of deputy, city of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the Senate bill modifying the so-called Capehart amendment, relating to covering expenses that may be considered in fixing price ceilings by the Office of Price Stabilization; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art without beginning or end of days, who countest the nations as the dust of the balance, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exaltest the humble and the meek: Allowed by Thee, we have been called to be servants of the Nation in a tense and tortured time when the world has been plowed with violence and when wars and rumors of war vex the earth; in such a day Thou hast summoned us to mend the flaws of our own democracy and to erase its blemishes, and to unleash the might of freedom against rampant evil bent on enslaving all people. Through this crucial period we have been, at best, unprofitable servants. As we come to the end of a chapter of our stewardship in these momentous times, there must be recorded this day "What I have written, I have written."

Now, unto Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves and all that has here been done and said. Pardon and overrule what has been done unworthily, or left undone or done amiss. Strengthen all that has been worthily achieved as we have followed flickering lights in a dark hour. And may the Lord bless us and keep us, and make His face to shine upon us, and give us peace, peace in our own hearts, peace in this dear land of ours, peace throughout all the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 19, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 20, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended;

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; and

S. 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) to make a change in the enrollment of Senate bill 355, the so-called postal salary increase bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement;

H. R. 5048. An act relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5048. An act relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Chavez	Frear
Benton	Connally	Fulbright
Butler, Md.	Cordon	George
Butler, Nebr.	Duff	Green
Cain	Dworshak	Hayden
Capehart	Ecton	Hendrickson
Carlson	Ellender	Hickenlooper
Case	Ferguson	Hill

Hoey	McCarran	Robertson
Humphrey	McClellan	Russell
Hunt	McFarland	Saltonstall
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Schoeppel
Johnston, S. C.	McMahon	Smathers
Kefauver	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Kerr	Monroney	Sparkman
Kilgore	Moody	Stennis
Knowland	Morse	Thye
Langer	Murray	Watkins
Lehman	Neely	Welker
Magnuson	O'Connor	Williams
Malone	O'Mahoney	Young
Maybank	Pastore	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senators from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER and Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday there are certain bills on the calendar which are now to be called. The bills were placed at the foot of the calendar yesterday.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURVEY REPORT ON GREEN RIVER WATERSHED, KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a survey report dated May 1950, on the Green River watershed, Kentucky and Tennessee, which with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Jacksonville (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 18, protesting against the opening of welfare rolls to public exposure, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2330. A bill for the relief of Antonios Emanuel Ragulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2331. A bill for the relief of Walayat Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 2332. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 2333. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Niarchos, Sofia Niarchos, and Gika Niarchos; and

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2335. A bill to incorporate the Future Homemakers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2336. A bill for the relief of Nicholas B. Perry for losses sustained through confiscation of property by Rumania and Hungary, or either of said countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2337. A bill to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2338. A bill to authorize pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2339. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON (by request):

S. 2340. A bill for the relief of certain Greek aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2341. A bill to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2342. A bill to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or

construct their homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 2343. A bill to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide non-quota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2344. A bill to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2345. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial of the institution of the Territorial government of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2346. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2347. A bill to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the last two above named bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada, relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States of America and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence Seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to provide an extension of time for the authorization for certain projects for local flood protection in the Tennessee River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

HEALTH CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency,

and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice, by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON LEGISLATION FOR HEALTH CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

This bill for health care for dependents of servicemen has a twofold purpose:

First, to declare the policy of Congress, and to provide that in a period of national emergency in which substantial numbers of our young men are called upon to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, maternity and infant care may be assured to their wives and infants.

Second, to establish as a national policy, and to provide that during the present national emergency, hospital care should be assured for all of the dependents of enlisted members of the Armed Forces.

This bill is being introduced, at this final point in the session, so that it may have careful study and consideration by the many groups and agencies who have been and are very properly concerned over the problem of health care for dependents of servicemen. These groups are both social-service groups and groups primarily interested in the welfare of our servicemen.

This bill is intended primarily as a framework against which the problem described above can be weighed, measured, and studied. The exact form the legislation should finally take must be assessed against a showing of existing or probable need for this legislation. This will require study and inquiry by the health subcommittee, whose staff is already at work on this aspect of the matter.

The programs provided for in this bill are of the utmost importance to the men in our Armed Forces and their families whose welfare is, I know, the common concern of all of us. It is my hope that we can work out legislation that will meet the need, and which will have general approval.

Under the bill, these programs would be administered by the several States with funds appropriated by the Federal Government. The States would, consistent with economy and efficiency and in conformity with the provisions of the bill, utilize voluntary nonprofit agencies or organizations in the health or medical field which are in a position to render services in the administration of the program at the State level.

The programs provided for by the bill would, in general, be administered in accordance with principles which were developed during the World War II emergency maternity and infant care program.

Title I of the bill provides for a Federal-State program of emergency maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces. Under the bill, hospital, medical, nursing and related services in connection with pregnancy and childbirth would be provided for the wife of any enlisted member of the Armed

Forces. In addition, hospital, medical, nursing, and related services in connection with care of infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces would be provided for. These services would be made available to the child of any enlisted member of the Armed Forces who has not attained the age of 5 years.

Title II of the bill is designed to protect enlisted members of the Armed Forces and their dependents from the unpredictable and income-consuming costs of hospital services. It authorizes the provision of hospital services to any dependent of an enlisted member of the Armed Forces as a bed patient. This means that under the bill, bed and board and such nursing services, laboratory services, ambulance service, use of operating room, staff services, and other services, drugs and appliances as are customarily furnished by a hospital to its bed patients, either through its own employees or through persons with whom it has made arrangements for such services, drugs, or appliances would be provided. Medical or surgical care, however, except as provided in title I in connection with maternity and infant care, and except as generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care, would not be provided. Similarly, hospitalization by hospitals which furnish primarily domiciliary care would not be provided.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make certain basic revisions in our immigration laws, chiefly designed to bring the quota system up to date, and remove the ancient relics of racial discrimination and discrimination against women from our immigration code. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2343) to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

This bill, of bipartisan sponsorship, is the result of long study and review of our immigration laws. It is the product of con-

sultation with and deliberation among more than 30 voluntary agencies and great religious groups and organizations which are concerned with immigration and the handicaps to its orderly and humane functioning.

Under the terms of this bill, the outmoded system of quota distribution, devised in 1924, and based on our population in 1890, would be modified so as to permit the orderly entry into the United States of the same number of persons already provided for by law, namely, 154,277 annually. This number, as originally laid down in our immigration law of 1924, which has never had a basic revision, is now inflexibly allocated among national origin groups, largely from Western Europe.

Thus, of the total number of persons annually eligible to enter the United States as immigrants under our quota laws, more than one-third of the total, or 65,721 quota numbers are allocated to persons of British descent and citizenship. Other large quotas are available for natives of France, Ireland, and other countries of northern and Western Europe.

These quotas are not being fully used. There is no prospect of their being fully used. Meanwhile, quotas for persons from southern and Eastern Europe—the ones who really need asylum, the ones for whom the United States could really provide home and haven, are far oversubscribed and mortgaged far into the future.

This is especially true of Italy, Greece, and the countries behind the iron curtain. Refugees from the latter areas especially, huddled in the overcrowded cities of Western Germany and Austria and Western Europe generally, look desperately across the Atlantic in the hope and dream of somehow finding haven here. These individuals have fled from behind the iron curtain, often at the risk of their lives, seeking the boon of freedom. The least we, in this country, can do at this time is to make room for the admission of some of these refugees to the maximum extent possible under our quota laws, consistent with the requirements and interests of our national security.

Nor do I wish to understate the importance of providing for the admission of numbers of Italians and Greeks who dream vainly now of joining their relatives in this country.

There is also the Middle East, with its refugees, some of whom should have the right to enter this country even under the limitations of our quota system.

Under the terms of the bill we have today introduced, the unused portion of these quotas would be pooled and allocated to persons of other national origins, like Italians, Greeks, Poles, Hungarians, and Arabs—to mention a few.

Under the terms of this bill, preferences would be established for political and religious persecutees, for relatives of American citizens, for relatives of aliens now resident in the United States, and for persons with special skills and talents especially needed in this country.

Under other terms of the bill, nonquota preference would be granted to persons who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States, and to their wives and children, and to orphans who are brought over for adoption by American citizens.

Another provision of the bill would strike out the archaic discrimination based on sex now existing in our immigration laws. Under present law, certain preferences are given to wives of American citizens but not to husbands. This kind of discrimination would be deleted from the entire body of our immigration code.

Still another vital provision would strike out the unsupportable discrimination based on race which now bars persons of certain oriental races from admission as immigrants into the United States under any circumstances.

A further important provision of the bill would establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals, to be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, to replace the present Board established by administrative regulations.

Other provisions are as follows:

1. To delete the present exemption of immigration proceedings from the terms of the Administrative Procedures Act.

2. To make eligible for admission into this country reformed Communists and Fascists who can prove that they are reformed and are now devoted to democratic principles; and also to make eligible individuals whose membership in Communist and Fascist organizations occurred or ended before they reached the age of 16.

I hope that this bill, which does not include, by any means, all the desirable improvements in our immigration laws, will provide a basis for a new approach to the whole subject of immigration. This is vital if we are to discharge successfully our responsibilities as world leaders and to demonstrate to the world that we are sincere in advocating principles based on equality of men of all races and nations.

From a purely selfish point of view, we can use the special skills, talents, and labor of these individuals in our expanding and dynamic economy.

MORTGAGE LOANS TO VETERANS DESIRING TO PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCT HOMES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or construct their homes.

I offer this proposal as one way of helping to solve a problem which has been a subject of great concern and a cause of much discussion in our committee during the last few months—the tight market for VA-guaranteed home loans.

I am introducing it at this time in order to give the veteran groups, the mortgage lenders, the home-building industry, the Government agencies concerned, and the public generally an opportunity to consider and study this legislation, so that when we return next session the Banking Committee will be able to make a determination as to what it should do with respect to this proposal in the light of the considered judgment of all those interested parties whom I have already mentioned and in the light of the conditions existing in the mortgage market at that time.

The legislation originated out of a discussion which took place on the Senate floor when the conference report on the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 was being considered. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was discussing the provision for direct loans to veterans and referred to the fact that the present authorization is almost exhausted and that unless the fund could be revolved by the sale of the existing mortgages which have been issued under the direct loan provisions of the act, not many new mortgage loans could be made. At that point, it occurred to me, and I so suggested to the Senator from Alabama, that we might help solve the problem by permitting the national service life insurance fund to invest some of its funds in these Government-guaranteed mort-

gages and thus provide a market for the mortgages held in the Veterans' Administration direct-loan portfolio. As of July 1, 1951, the national service life insurance fund amounted to \$5,411,700,000, and the bill I am introducing would permit the fund to invest 20 percent of the moneys in VA-guaranteed home loans. At the present time it is my understanding that the fund is invested in a special issue of 3-percent treasuries. Since the net yield on these VA-guaranteed mortgages would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 3½ to 3¾ percent, the income of the fund would be increased to the advantage of the veterans and the Government would not have to pay the 3-percent interest on the funds so invested, as it does now on the national service life insurance fund, but could obtain its funds in the open market at a lower rate.

I am aware that this is a very complicated subject and deserves and will get a great deal of careful study and consideration before our committee takes any action on it. However, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee I am terribly concerned about the present difficulties which veterans are confronted with in financing their home purchases, and I feel it is my duty and responsibility to do everything in my power to assist in working out ways and means of solving such problems.

The bill (S. 2342) to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or construct their homes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONSTRUCTION-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES IN CASES OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2344) to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

The bill which I have just introduced is designed to preserve the capacity of American manufacturers to produce the most advanced types of large transport aircraft.

For many years the American manufacturers have occupied a position of world leadership in the production of transport aircraft. A recent civil aeronautics board survey reports that 80 percent of the aircraft currently being used by scheduled common carrier airlines of the world are manufactured in the United States. The most modern of American-built transport aircraft today are being used almost exclusively by both American-flag and foreign air

carriers on all the major competitive international air routes. Lockheed Constellations, Douglas DC-6's, and Boeing Stratocruisers at this moment are flying the Atlantic and Pacific under the flags, not only of the United States, but also of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and other countries.

There is no foreign-built aircraft which today is effectively competing in transoceanic service with these American-built aircraft.

There is no foreign-built aircraft which today is effectively competing in transoceanic service with these American-built aircraft.

This world-wide demand has enabled the American manufacturers to develop a tremendous capacity for producing modern, high-quality aircraft, and the significance of this capacity, from the national-defense viewpoint, cannot be over emphasized. No one can forget the brilliant response made by the American aircraft manufacturers in World War II when the allies' need for aircraft was so urgent. Fleets of American-made bombers turned the tide of the war. But had it not been for the extensive experience and existing capacity of those manufacturers, their brilliant contribution might never have been achieved.

But we can see, or foresee, the rapid emergence of an imminent threat to the continuing capacity of the American manufacturers to develop and produce modern transport aircraft.

Various European manufacturers, recognizing that the established American ability to produce the conventional reciprocating-engine type aircraft could not effectively be met, have devoted their efforts to developing, with extensive Government technical and financial assistance, new and advanced types of engines and airframes for the aircraft of the future. Turbines and jets have successfully been adapted to transport aircraft by foreign manufacturers.

Turbo-jet and turbo-prop commercial transport aircraft, with their greater speed and other advantages, may soon be appearing in competitive international air transportation. The Civil Aeronautics Board, in its recent survey of this subject, stated:

"A recent innovation is BOAC's use of the Handley Page Hermes turbo-prop aircraft on some of its scheduled services. While another turbo-prop aircraft of British manufacture (the Vickers Viscount), the British jet (DeHavilland Comet), and the Canadian jet (Avro Jetliner) have not as yet been put into regular use on scheduled services, they are being given trial tests which may result in their being placed in regular service relatively soon."

Foreign air carriers have already indicated their intention to adopt these more advanced planes, and if such adoption proves to be commercially successful, the American-flag international air carriers will certainly be compelled to do likewise to maintain their competitive status.

Thus, possibly for the first time, the American aircraft manufacturers soon may be faced with foreign competitors placing on the world market transport aircraft superior to anything now being produced in the United States. Moreover, in view of the technical and financial assistance that foreign governments are and have been putting into their own aircraft production, plus the lower production costs encountered in foreign countries, there is a very serious possibility that American manufacturers, acting independently, will not be able to offer a comparable product at a competitive price on the world market. The inescapable consequences of such a situation, unless remedial action is taken promptly, will be that the foreign manufacturers soon will displace the American manufacturers as suppliers of the modern types of commercial transport aircraft to the airlines of the world.

Such a development would inevitably result in a drastic curtailment of transport aircraft production in American aircraft plants, and in the absence of actual production, the highly significant productive capacity of those plants could not be maintained.

To avoid the ominous implications of such a development, my new bill proposes to establish a construction-differential subsidy which will enable American aircraft manufacturers to produce for American-flag international air carriers the most modern transport aircraft, of whatever type the future may hold, at a price competitive with comparable aircraft constructed by foreign manufacturers. Such a subsidy will enable the American manufacturers to retain at least the very sizable proportion of the world aircraft market represented by the American-flag international air carriers; and to the extent that such a subsidy will help defray the high initial cost of originating new types of aircraft, the American manufacturers may thus be assisted toward attaining a status whereby they could compete without subsidy in the sale of such aircraft in the world market generally and in the American domestic market.

This bill follows in principle the construction-differential subsidy procedure which has been applicable to American merchant marine construction since 1936. The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to grant the American-flag international air carriers a construction-differential subsidy for the purchase of aircraft from American manufacturers for use in international air transportation. To qualify for the subsidy, the air carrier must submit to the Board detailed information regarding the proposed aircraft. The Board, in conjunction with other interested agencies, will review the plans and will certify them for a construction-differential subsidy to the extent that such plans effectuate the purposes of the Civil Aeronautics Act. The construction-differential subsidy, to be paid by the Board, will be equal to the excess of the price of the proposed aircraft produced by an American manufacturer over the price of comparable aircraft produced by foreign manufacturers. The subsidy is restricted to aircraft produced for use in international air transportation. If such subsidized aircraft is used by an American-flag international air carrier in other than international air transportation, a proportionate repayment of the subsidy to the Government, based on the remaining economic life of the aircraft, is required. The purpose of this restriction is to limit the construction-differential subsidy to the international field, where the initial competitive impact is felt, and to prevent international air carriers, who also operate domestic routes, from competing with such subsidized aircraft against other domestic air carriers.

Unless the Congress enacts some such legislation as this, the American aircraft-manufacturing industry may soon find itself irretrievably behind the parade, instead of being in the position of leadership which we in America have come to expect of it, and which is so important to this Nation. I therefore commend this bill to my colleagues for careful study between now and the reconvening of the Congress to the end that there may be some hope for action on the measure early in the next session.

RETIREMENT OF NON-REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years of active Federal service under the same conditions presently in effect for officers having less than 30 years of service.

As presently written, the law discriminates against officers who have served over 30 years. I have had an analysis of the existing law made by the legislative counsel and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as an explanation of my bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2346) to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The analysis is as follows:

Section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 943a) provides in pertinent part that non-Regular officers of the Army must be retired in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army when they have completed "not less than 20 or more than 30 years' active Federal service in the Armed Forces of the United States, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service." Officers who qualify for retirement under that provision receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active duty base and longevity pay "of the rank with which retired" multiplied by the number of years of service credited to them for pay purposes, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of such active duty base and longevity pay.

If Colonel Cox were eligible to retire under that section, and did in fact retire prior to January 1, 1957, he would be eligible under subsection 203 (f) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.) to be retired in the temporary grade held at the time of his retirement, and to receive retirement pay based on that grade. Thus he could retire with the grade and retired pay of a lieutenant colonel. As the enlisted and commissioned active service of Colonel Cox now exceeds 30 years, he cannot qualify for retirement under section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935, as amended.

As stated in the attached third endorsement of the Adjutant General, dated July 12, 1950, Colonel Cox is eligible for reenlistment and retirement as a master sergeant. If he were to follow that course, he would upon retirement be advanced on the retired list, pursuant to subsection 203 (e) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, to the highest temporary grade held by him between September 9, 1940, and June 30, 1946, and he would be eligible to receive retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law for his length of service at the time of retirement but based upon such temporary commissioned grade. Thus, in determining his retired grade and pay he would receive no benefit from any temporary promotion received by him after June 30, 1946. Moreover, as subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)) affirmatively prohibits the making of a cash settlement for unused accrued leave in the case of any person discharged for the purpose of entering into an enlistment in his branch of the Armed Forces, Colonel Cox would lose the benefit of payment for his accrued leave computed on the basis of his active duty pay as a commissioned officer. However, his present unused leave could be carried over into his enlistment as a master sergeant, and upon retirement as an enlisted man he would be

granted such payment based upon the active duty base and longevity pay of a master sergeant.

The distinction in treatment described above appears to be the result of the historical evolution of the pertinent statutes. Prior to 1935, commissioned officers of the Regular Army could retire for years of service only after the completion of 30 years' service, and such retirement was accomplished under section 1243 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 943) in the permanent grade held at the time of retirement, with retirement pay equal to 75 percent of the base and longevity pay of that grade. In 1935 that section was supplemented by a provision (49 Stat. 507; 10 U. S. C. 943a) which permitted commissioned officers of the Regular Army to retire in their permanent grades if they had served not less than 15 or more than 29 years, with retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of their active duty pay in such grades multiplied by the number of their years of active service credited for pay purposes. Section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 amended that provision (1) to apply only to officers having not less than 20 or more than 30 years' service, and (2) to permit non-Regular officers to retire thereunder if they had completed at least 10 years of active commissioned service. No comparable amendment was made to section 1243 of the Revised Statutes to permit non-Regular officers to retire thereunder after more than 30 years' active service. Accordingly, under present law non-Regular officers of the Army having more than 30 years' active service are accorded less favorable retirement than that granted to such officers who have less than 30 years' service, and are therefore eligible for retirement pursuant to section 5 of the act of 1935, as amended by section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

If proposed legislation is desired to accord to non-Regular commissioned officers having more than 30 years' service the same benefits now available to such officers having less than 30 years' service, it is suggested that such result could be obtained by a bill which would (a) repeal section 1243 of the Revised Statutes; and (b) strike from section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935, as amended, the limiting phrase "or more than 30," thereby making that section the basis for the retirement for years of service of all commissioned officers having more than 20 years' service.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN C. HERBERG,
Assistant Counsel.

JUNE 26, 1951.

CHANGE OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in support of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2347) to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by

its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN IN SUPPORT OF BILL

I recommend not only that the Personnel Policy Board support the Army's proposal that the date June 30, 1953, appearing in section 514 (d) (3) Officer Personnel Act of 1947 be changed to June 30, 1956, but that in the act compulsory retirement be fixed at not less than age 60.

In support of this recommendation I quote from chapter 3 of the report by the Advisory Commission on Service Pay, with which I am in complete agreement:

"In planning a retirement program, it is of the greatest importance that the philosophy or purpose upon which it is founded is sound and will continue sound as far as can be seen into the future.

"There are a number of such purposes which can be offered as bases for a retirement plan for the members of the uniformed forces. For example, it can be urged that an adequate retirement program is essential to attract the right kind of men to the services; that a retirement program is necessary to meet the Government's broad social obligations with respect to its employees; or that a retirement program is essential as an aid in administration, that is, that without such a plan, undesirable men and those who cannot advance in grade cannot be separated from the services. And finally, it can be urged that a sound retirement plan is an essential tool in meeting the superannuation problem, using this phrase in its broadest possible sense.

"All these and perhaps other reasons may be advanced for a retirement program; but in the opinion of the Commission, the only reason not subject to serious debate, and which has a philosophy behind it that can be upheld without important challenge, is that the fundamental purpose of a retirement plan (accompanied by compulsory retirement at a fixed age) is to meet the superannuation problem. One can hardly disagree that the services must be kept alert and vigorous if they are to perform their function successfully in critical times. The services can scarcely be kept alert and vigorous and provide the kind of leadership necessary to win wars unless men are compelled to retire from active service at reasonable ages and there is immediately available to them an appropriate retirement benefit.

"A study of military benefit programs as far back as they can be traced, indicates that this concept is uppermost in the minds of those who established and continued them. To the taxpayer who finally pays the bill—and it is and will be a substantial bill—the philosophy of meeting the superannuation problem, including not only age but other factors affecting ability and competence, is the only one which for the long pull will make sense to the citizen and strike most reasoning people as being good business for the Government.

"The Commission's plan to cover the problems of voluntary and involuntary retirement, is based on this fundamental principle; it is designed primarily to meet the many problems of superannuation. The proposed death benefit plan is a logical corollary; it considers the problem of the survivors of those who die in the services or after retirement."

"Recommendation 23: E. Compulsory retirement for age of officers should be that fixed by law, but in no case below age 60."

"DISCUSSION"

"As stated, a sound retirement system is essential to solving the superannuation problem. The services must be kept young, vigorous, and efficient; a sound retirement

plan with a proper compulsory retirement age will permit youth and brains to rise to the top in time to be effective. This emphasis on youth is more important in the military services than in most other activities of Government and industry because of the physical demands of war conditions when the Regular Establishment becomes the nucleus around which the civilian elements are organized. This vitalization purpose is not new; it was the fundamental premise of the present retirement system as established 80-odd years ago. Other concepts of fair treatment and the traditional concepts of retirement for those taking up the profession of arms are also important and have been given consideration but the Commission does not believe them to be controlling."

"The seven services, because of the different nature of their missions, have varying ages at which personnel must be retired under the law. The Commission recommends that in no case should mandatory retirement for age of officers be below age 60."

I am of the sincere opinion that not only is it unwise to compel the bulk of our officers to retire in their early fifties (which is what the operations of the present provisions of the act will do) and thus lose to the Department of Defense experience and mature judgment expensively bought just at the time when it can be capitalized on most profitably but that neither the Congress nor the country will tolerate it when they come to the full realization of what the retirement provisions of the present Personnel Act will do if allowed to stand.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF STEEL

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of steel, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the joint resolution by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) to prohibit the exportation of steel, introduced by Mr. Chavez, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

I have sent to the desk for referral to the proper committee of the Senate a joint resolution to prohibit the export of steel from the United States. I do not seek any immediate action on this measure. Rather, I want the Senators to look into the steel picture as it affects their States during the recess with respect to schools, hospitals, roads, and small business, and then after January 3 we can take up the measure.

In the first quarter of 1952 there is authorized for export 1,067,500 tons. This is about 5 percent of the total domestic production for the quarter.

Doubtless some of this steel is going directly into military assistance abroad. If this is true, I think the military should be the claimant agency. We should combine the claimants as we have the budget requests, so we know exactly who is claiming steel and for what.

I sincerely hope that steel which is exported is not going into structures and materials abroad which are being denied steel here at home. In the past, I have found foreign countries could get things which

we could not. I believe the Senate should examine into this whole situation at the earliest possible moment next year.

The joint resolution as I introduced it today is severely drastic, and it will have to be modified before any action is taken on this measure. There will have to be certain exceptions, I am sure, but I believe we ought to find out what these exceptions are before allowing them, and then we should allow only these and no more.

This 1,067,500 tons of steel allowed for export when distributed back to our own schools, roads, hospitals, and small business would mean a material difference.

The United States consumers are being asked to squeeze down hard on demand. I wonder if those to whom the exports are going are being pushed as hard.

Those who receive the exports have powerful lobbies in the Military Establishment and the State Department, and the warring of the Soviets. It combines into an effective argument before the National Production Administration.

Those domestic consumers who lobby for Americanism are accused of being selfish or resisting the war effort. The foreign sources say "we want to help win the war," and often it doesn't turn out that way at all. At home all we can say is we want to help our fellow citizens.

I hope the Senators will give this matter considerable thought while they are in their home States during this recess.

INVESTIGATION OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

Mr. McMAHON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. LONG, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. KERR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 229), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. and its affiliated companies serving 11 States and operating more than 10,000 miles of railroad has for 18 years been in bankruptcy resulting from the depression following 1929; and

Whereas it is highly desirable to return this railroad to its owners without further extended litigation which will attend the proposed plan of reorganization; and

Whereas during the period of bankruptcy the system spent from its earnings approximately \$675,000,000 for retirement of debt, payment of interest on bonds, and for the improvement of the physical plant, including particularly the purchase of new equipment, reduction of grades, and other improved operating facilities, thereby enhancing the equity of the stockholders and increasing the net earning capacity of the railroad; and

Whereas since 1947 there has been extraordinary industrial development in the territory served by the Missouri Pacific which has greatly increased the earning powers of the railroad; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has certified three different plans of reorganization, the last of which again eliminates participation by the common-stock holders and allows but slight participation for the preferred-stock holders after finding that the claims of bondholder-creditors have been fully satisfied; and

Whereas the new plan of reorganization and the report embodying it states that the fair depreciated value of the properties is \$715,222,053 and advises, on the basis of capitalizing earnings for various periods, there are bases for capitalization as high as \$952,331,711 and the trustee has stated the total system assets are of a value of \$835,052,387

and yet the Commission in its final determination fixes \$612,000,000 for the permissible capitalization; and

Whereas during the recent period 1941-50 the system has earned after taxes \$405,187,320 available for the payment of interest and dividends; and

Whereas on the basis of these earnings figures and after allowing for interest on all outstanding bonds, taxes, and dividends on the preferred stock, there have been average earnings during the period 1941-50 of \$17.55 per share on the old common stock, but despite this earnings record, the proposed plan of reorganization would completely wipe out the interest of the old common-stock holders; and

Whereas unless the present plan is modified so as to give the old common-stock holders some recognition in the reorganized company, they will be forced to appeal the plan through the Federal courts, thereby delaying the discharge of the railroad from bankruptcy for a period of several years; and

Whereas there has been vast improvement since 1949 in the national economy and the sectional areas served by the Missouri Pacific Railroad which will permanently increase the earning power of the railroad; and

Whereas it is alleged that the railroad is now solvent and no longer in need of reorganization under the Bankruptcy Act; and

Whereas irregularities are alleged in the voting, counting and certification of the ballots on the pending reorganization plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the changed conditions affecting the earning power of the railroad that have occurred in recent years, the present need for reorganization of the railroad, the alleged irregularities in the voting, counting and certification of the ballots on the pending reorganization plan, the denial of participation of the old common-stock holders, and the limited participation of the old preferred-stock holders under the pending reorganization plan and such other matters as the committee shall deem necessary to a just and expeditious release of the railroad from reorganization proceedings. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A statement prepared by him relative to Gen. Harry Schmidt, United States Marine Corps.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

A statement prepared by him and editorials from the Elizabeth (N. J.) Daily Journal and the Bergen (N. J.) Herald in regard to the fight against cancer.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him concerning the proposal to create a national association, or of federation, of citizens crime commissions.

By Mr. CASE:

Article entitled "Australians Asking if Gold Standard Is on Way Back," written by Albert E. Norman and published in the Christian Science Monitor of October 17, 1951.

By Mr. MALONE:

Debate on the American Forum of the Air on the subject Box Score for the Eighty-second Congress, held on October 14, 1951, and participated in by Senator KERR, Senator MALONE, Representative ROONEY, and Representative HALL.

Resolution regarding William N. Oatis, adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 487, Winnemucca, Nev., on September 10, 1951, and identical resolutions adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 1213, Las Vegas, Nev., and Aerie No. 1006, Carson City, Nev.

Testimony of Mr. Robert Yellow Tail, of Lodge Grass, Mont., on February 26, 1948, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in hearings on Senate bill 2037.

"Nevada's Place in America Today," winning essay in the senior division of the State-wide American Legion essay contest in Nevada, by Robert Quinlan, a graduate of the 1951 class at Carson City, Nev., high school.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer before Ohio State University Advertising Conference at Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1951.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Resolutions affecting Federal-State relations, adopted by the Forty-third Governor's Conference at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on October 3, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne, before the Service Clubs at Bismarck, N. Dak.

Article entitled "North Dakota Comes Into Its Own," written by Leo A. Borah and published in the National Geographic magazine of September 1951.

Editorial entitled "An All Canadian Seaway" published in the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1951.

Copy of letter addressed to the Christian Century by Gerald Kennedy, of the Methodist Church, Portland, Ore.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Article entitled "General Overcomes His Modesty," written by Lowell Mellett and published in today's Washington Evening Star.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "Hemorrhage From a Sore Toe," printed in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of October 18, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "RFC Has Proved Target of Politics From Very First," by Ralph Thornton, published in the Minneapolis Star of October 11, 1951.

By Mr. KERR:

Resolution of National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners; resolution of Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions, and address before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Charleston, S. C., October 16, 1951, by Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address to be delivered by Mr. Moody before the Economic Club of Detroit, Monday, October 22, 1951.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him at a luncheon of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, at Milwaukee, Wis., October 18, 1951.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Air Power and Morality," published in the Spotlight, regarding the use of the airplane as an instrument of peace.

Article entitled "How To Win the United States Senate in 14—Ah, Simple Lessons," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of October 19, 1951.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Editorial entitled "One Man Crusade," published in the New Orleans State of October 19, 1951, dealing with the activities of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

By Mr. CAIN:

Broadcast by him on the program entitled "American Youth Forum," on September 15, 1951, discussing the question of universal military training.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from pamphlet entitled "The Crime of Genocide," prepared by the Serbian National Defense Council of America.

Letter to New York Times by Kenneth Haskell Mantell, on Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address entitled "Columbia, the River of the West," delivered by W. L. Williams before the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Report regarding policies and practices of the National Shipping Authority in the appointment of general agents and in the allocation of vessels to such agents, from C. H. McGuire, Director, National Shipping Authority, dated October 1, 1951.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I addressed to Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, relative to the 30 or more Americans who are being held prisoners by the Communists, to which reference was made in the article entitled "China's 'Oatis Cases,'" written by Marguerite Higgins, and published in the Washington Post of October 2, 1951; a copy of the article by Miss Higgins; a letter, dated October 15, 1951, from Assistant Secretary Dean Rusk, in response to my letter; and a copy of a State Department press release dated May 21, 1951, dealing with the subject.

I may say that Mr. Rusk has personally furnished me with the names of the individuals involved, but has asked that I agree with his request that the names not be released at this time.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1951.

HON. DEAN RUSK,

Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSK: With further reference to our telephone conversation of yesterday, I would appreciate it very much if you would

send me a list of the 30 Americans who are now being held by the Chinese Communists as mentioned in Marguerite Higgins' column in the New York Herald Tribune and Washington Post of yesterday. Enclosed is a copy of the article which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2. It is possible that the number may be greater than the thirty she mentions and in any event what I would like to have is full information as to all Americans now being detained by the Chinese Communists, the nature of their detention, the period of time they have been in custody, and a brief biographical statement relative to each such person.

I would appreciate it very much if this information could be sent to me this week.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

[From the Washington Post, October 2, 1951]

CHINA'S OATIS CASES

(By Marguerite Higgins)

AMERICANS JUST VANISHED

HONG KONG, October 1.—Anguished Americans waiting here for news of friends and relatives in China's jails, wonder whether the United States has not adopted an international double standard regarding the Chinese Communists. There are at least 30 "Vogeler" or "Oatis" cases in China today. They are cases which would undoubtedly cause the greatest indignation if they had been perpetrated in Eastern Europe. But the sufferings of the Americans in China seem to cause comparatively hardly a stir.

In one sense, the Chinese treatment is far more cruel than the mock trials of Eastern Europe. Oatis and Vogeler, at least in theory, knew the charges against them. Their families had an approximate idea of their fate. But since January, when the number of arrests began to mount in Communist China, most Americans have just vanished. Their families have no means of knowing where they are or whether they are dead or alive.

A tragic example is the case in Shanghai of Robert T. Bryan, lawyer, former municipal advocate, and certainly one of the best known and beloved Americans in the Far East. He was literally yanked out of his bath in his Shanghai home on the morning of February 12. The Chinese secret police gave him enough time to get dressed and put together a bundle, then marched him off, ignoring the pleas of his wife to tell her where he was being taken.

Mrs. Bryan has remained in Shanghai, a lonely figure in the rapidly shrinking foreign colony. A foreign diplomat, who came out of the city last month, said she has borne up well. The only crack in her morale came one day several months ago. On that occasion she left home for a few hours and returned to find a Chinese policeman at the door, bearing the message that during her unusually long absence her husband had tried to reach her. Mrs. Bryan was never able to confirm whether the policeman's message was the truth or mere psychological warfare.

EUROPEANS SHARE FATE

The arrested Americans are divided just about equally between missionaries, Catholics and Protestants, and businessmen. The total of 30 represents those positively known to be in prison or under house arrest. There may be more.

Although the Americans seem to be the most numerous victims, their fate is shared to a degree by all nationalities as a result of the violent antiforeign campaign being whipped up by the Government which clearly would prefer to operate its own "public trials" and liquidation campaigns without having to worry about observation of foreigners. It is generally conceded that

the Chinese Communists aim at nothing less than the elimination of all foreign-sponsored educational, church and medical activities. They are also moving slowly to bring about the gradual shut-down of consulates and the forcing out of foreign businesses.

The antimissionary campaign is carried out mainly by inciting Chinese to indulge in public denunciations of foreign churchmen who are then imprisoned or expelled.

The "Resist United States Aid Korea Journal," published in Peiping on September 12, states that "according to incomplete figures for this area in May, June, July, and August the number of imperialist elements denounced in the accusation campaign reached 113, most of whom belong to the Catholic Church and are mainly American, French, Spanish, Italian, Belgian, Dutch and German. The number of persons expelled from China, as requested by the patriotic Chinese religious followers and the people of all circles reached 33. Some others have been put under control, arrested, ordered to apologize and repent, or sentenced to prison terms."

The Communist journal added: "The foreign imperialist missionaries with a saintly mask asserted that they singly devoted themselves conscientiously to the work on the propagation of religion and relief and that they were above politics. But irrefutable evidence exposed in various places has proven that these imperialists under the cloak of religion are out-and-out counter-revolutionaries. According to figures checked by the Peiping government the number of children murdered by the foreign missionaries throughout the nation reached more than 100,000."

By resorting to such flamboyant and absurd charges, it is no wonder that a certain amount of "mass feeling" has been whipped up against foreigners.

The greatest scandal in China is the death in Wuchow jail of Dr. William Wallace. Southern Baptist American authorities here have been sufficiently satisfied by the evidence to report to Washington that his death was most likely the result of Communist mis-handling.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
October 19, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Subsequent to your letter to me of October 3, 1951, and my conversation with you in your office, I have had further investigations made on the subject of Americans detained in Communist China. One troublesome aspect is the difficulty of obtaining accurate and up-to-date information on just what the situation is in many sections of Communist China. We have no official representation whatever and the representation of friendly governments is severely limited.

While the Department has made public the general situation of Americans in China (e. g., its press release of May 21 which is attached), it has not given publicity to the names of individuals, as in numerous cases either the persons themselves or their relatives or associates desire that no publicity be given for fear of impairing rescue moves or for fear of serious consequences to the individuals themselves.

The Department has been endeavoring for some time to obtain, through efforts of the British Government which has undertaken to assist in the protection of American citizens in China, the release of American citizens or, as a minimum measure, to secure for them the basic rights of communication with the outside, adequate counsel and a fair and open trial upon any charges brought against them. Other governments having nationals in China are also confronted with the same problem and have

made similar moves. It is not desirable, in connection with our main concern in rescuing these Americans, to make a public announcement at this time about precise measures which are now in course directed toward the release of our citizens.

Almost without exception, Americans now in China were clearly warned of the dangers and difficulties which they might encounter if they elected to remain behind in China at a time when facilities for leaving the country were available. This factor in no way reduces the concern or responsibility of the Department of State to do everything which can be done to protect our citizens on the mainland of China. The great majority of Americans caught in the turbulence of recent events in China have succeeded in leaving the country safely. We now estimate that there are about 300 Americans still in mainland China and it is recognized that, whether specific individuals are under arrest or not, the position of most of them is unsatisfactory.

Every feasible means will continue to be used in an effort to assist those who wish to leave China to do so.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

AMERICANS DETAINED BY COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES IN CHINA

The Department of State has been extremely concerned for an extended period of time over the imprisonment by Chinese Communist authorities of a number of American nationals, now believed to number more than 30. At least some are definitely known to have been allowed no communication with anyone outside. In most cases the local Chinese Communist authorities have given no explanation of the arrests or any information concerning the welfare or whereabouts of the persons arrested. Access has been denied to legal counsel and to British officials, who have been representing American interests in Communist China since the closure of our consulates. This Government has been in constant communication on this subject with the British Government.

On April 30 the British Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, acting on instructions of the Foreign Office, made representations to the responsible Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping on behalf of all Americans arrested, as well as the United Kingdom, Canadian, and Australian nationals under arrest. He appealed to these authorities to take appropriate steps to permit those imprisoned to have access to legal counsel and to friends outside. It was hoped that their speedy release would be effected, on humanitarian no less than on equitable grounds. No reply has yet been received by the British Government from the Chinese Communist authorities.

The Department of State has also been concerned for some time over the continued denial by Chinese Communist authorities of exit permits to certain Americans, including a number of Shanghai businessmen, some of whom have been endeavoring for over a year to leave China. Arbitrary refusal to permit aliens to depart from a country is of course a violation of the elementary principles of international law and practice.

JAPANESE AND GERMAN STEEL PRODUCTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received from the Department of the Army in response to a request for information on the steel production and the

export of steel from Germany and Japan, which I made in light of the shortage of steel for school construction purposes during the last few days.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1951.
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.
(Attention Mr. George F. Wilson.)

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your informal request for information concerning Japanese and German steel production, I have had the attached tabulation prepared by the Munitions Board, which I trust will furnish you the desired data.

In the event you desire further information on this subject, I shall be happy to endeavor to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,

Deputy Chief for Personnel and
Administration.

German production and exports of steel, 1950 [Metric tons]

1. Ingots:	
Production.....	11,814,000
Exports.....	12,151,000
Percent exported.....	10.9
2. Principal exports and markets:	
(a) Cast iron pipe.....	81,000
Australia.....	22,000
Turkey.....	11,500
Netherlands.....	8,000
(b) Cast iron cylinders.....	9,000
Saar.....	3,300
Italy.....	900
Hungary.....	700
(c) Heating ironware.....	7,000
Netherlands.....	2,800
Bulgaria.....	1,550
Turkey.....	1,400
(d) Bathtubs.....	3,500
Italy.....	400
Switzerland.....	400
Belgium.....	300
Australia.....	440
(e) Processed cast iron.....	5,000
Netherlands.....	1,200
Switzerland.....	400
Denmark.....	300
(f) Steel blocks.....	95,000
Great Britain.....	25,000
Argentina.....	19,000
Italy.....	16,000
(g) Iron bars (8 millimeter).....	33,000
Iran.....	7,000
Sweden.....	5,200
Switzerland.....	2,700

¹ Exports are in the form of pipes, bars, rails, etc., consequently not strictly comparable. Greater detail and comparable data, if at all available, would require a considerable amount of time in translation and preparation.

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

(h) Iron in other forms.....	454,000
Sweden.....	55,000
Netherlands.....	50,000
Egypt.....	30,000
Hungary.....	28,000
Denmark.....	23,000
Switzerland.....	21,000
(i) Hoop iron.....	83,000
Netherlands.....	15,700
United States.....	8,600
Sweden.....	6,000
Italy.....	6,000
Greece.....	5,000
(j) Sheets (4.76 millimeters).....	158,000
Sweden.....	40,000
United States.....	31,700
Netherlands.....	19,700
Finland.....	8,500
(k) Sheets (1-4.76 millimeters).....	123,600
Hong Kong.....	26,400
United States.....	19,500
Italy.....	10,100
(l) Sheets (under 1 millimeter).....	67,600
Italy.....	12,900
United States.....	5,400
Netherlands.....	5,200
Sweden.....	4,800
(m) Tin plates.....	47,700
Netherlands.....	11,100
China.....	7,900
Spain.....	7,000
Sweden.....	6,500
(n) Galvanized sheets.....	21,900
Union of South Africa.....	5,700
Switzerland.....	3,200
Denmark.....	2,000
(o) Corrugated sheets.....	9,800
Union of South Africa.....	1,900
Norway.....	1,900
Turkey.....	1,500
(p) Hot-drawn wire.....	114,200
United States.....	44,600
Great Britain.....	22,100
Sweden.....	6,600
Turkey.....	6,300
(q) Cold-drawn wire.....	36,500
Union of South Africa.....	3,500
Netherlands.....	3,200
Australia.....	3,000
Belgium.....	2,800
(r) Processed wire.....	55,300
Union of South Africa.....	12,000
Australia.....	8,500
United States.....	4,900
(s) Steel pipe.....	102,500
Netherlands.....	17,800
United States.....	9,300
Great Britain.....	7,900
Denmark.....	6,700

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

(t) Processed pipe (over 2 millimeters)	Exports
United States	15,200
Netherlands	12,900
Hong Kong	4,800
Venezuela	4,500
(u) Processed pipe (under 2 millimeters)	8,200
United States	5,900
(v) Rails	100,500
Egypt	28,300
Arabia	20,500
Turkey	14,000
(w) Railroad sleepers (ties)	34,200
Turkey	20,300
Switzerland	9,500
Netherlands	2,300
(x) Fish bed plates	19,300
Netherlands	7,600
Argentina	3,600
Italy	2,300
(y) Railway axles and irons	16,000
Hungary	2,500
Belgium	2,000
Netherlands	1,600
(z) Processed goods of malleable iron	65,900
Netherlands	10,200
Australia	7,500
Turkey	6,400
Yugoslavia	4,800
Belgium	4,300
(aa) Pipes and tubes, other than drawn	65,900
Netherlands	6,300
Brazil	5,700
India	5,200
Pakistan	3,800

Official sources: Department of Commerce.

Japanese steel production and exports, 1950
[Metric tons]

1. Steel ingots:	
Production	4,838,520
Exports	78,706
Percent exported	
Finished steel total:	
Production	3,471,336
Exports	461,218
Percent exported	10.3
2. Principal exports and markets:	
(a) Steel bars not over 15 millimeters	Exports 21,262
Darien	2,583
China, North	5,841
Thailand	3,227
Australia	3,368
(b) Steel bars over 15 millimeters	60,398
China, North	22,674
Formosa	6,370
Hong Kong	2,540
Thailand	4,211
Argentina	19,315
Australia	1,977

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

(c) T bars, angle steels	Exports
China, North	7,173
Formosa	1,870
Argentina	3,038
(d) Steel wire rods	12,030
China, North	8,025
Argentina	2,467
(e) Steel rail	15,119
Formosa	7,290
Thailand	7,809
(f) Steel plate, uncoated not over 0.9 millimeter thick	16,203
China, North	6,761
Argentina	6,101
Australia	2,066
(g) Steel plate uncoated not over 3 millimeters thick	8,810
China, North	1,913
Argentina	3,786
Australia	2,050
(h) Steel plate uncoated not over 5.7 millimeters thick	13,745
China, North	5,996
Hong Kong	1,775
Argentina	1,783
Australia	3,261
(i) Steel plate uncoated over 5.7 millimeters thick	53,545
China, North	12,591
Hong Kong	4,933
United States	14,355
Argentina	6,586
Australia	6,901
(j) Tin plate	2,744
Australia	1,697
(k) Galvanized sheet	149,305
China, North	16,288
Hong Kong	10,159
Philippine Republic	18,465
Nigeria	11,248
Australia	55,064
(l) Steel band hot rolled over 50 millimeters wide	6,303
Argentina	6,255
(m) Steel wire uncoated	26,053
China, North	3,194
Philippine Republic	10,542
Argentina	9,503
(n) Steel wire coated	26,617
Formosa	7,056
Hong Kong	4,681
Thailand	2,130
India	5,049
Australia	3,354
(o) Steel pipe not over 45 millimeters	7,642
China, North	4,869

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

(p) Steel pipe not over 150 millimeters	Exports
China, North	2,374
Argentina	1,956
(q) Steel pipe over 150 millimeters	4,961
Formosa	2,418
Okinawa	1,529
(r) Steel pipe coated with base metals	6,248
Darien	1,086
Argentina	2,772

Official sources: SCAP.

THE YALTA TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received from the Department of the Army in response to an inquiry for the telephone directory of the Yalta Conference.

I may say that the letter was stamped "Restricted," but on my own responsibility I am asking that the letter be printed in the RECORD in order to show what I believe is an extreme case of the practice of stamping of letters under present security regulations. The letter makes reference to the telephone directory which was used at the Yalta Conference in February 1945. In the letter I am informed that the telephone directory is still classified "Restricted."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1951.
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to your letter of September 5, 1951, in which you requested a copy of the Argonaut telephone directory.

Since writing to you on September 10, we have located a copy of the directory, which I have enclosed. The directory is classified "Restricted." However, should this classification be changed, you will be advised.

Since this publication is out of print, it is requested that it be returned to this office at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

K. B. LAWTON,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Chief Signal Officer.

HAVEN AFFORDED BY SWEDEN TO REFUGEES FROM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for approximately 2½ minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed for 2½ minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on September 11, I introduced a bill to provide permanent residence in this country for 84 Estonians who had fled to these shores from the terror and tyranny behind the iron curtain.

These individuals came by way of Sweden, and they crossed the Atlantic in small boats, daring the hazards of the open sea rather than the greater hazards of a possible return to Estonia.

At the time when I introduced that bill, I made a statement in which I indicated that had these people remained in Sweden they would have been forcibly repatriated to Estonia, inasmuch as Sweden had recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the Swedish Government in the United States have informed me that I was mistaken in part of my statement. They have advised me that Sweden generally gives asylum to refugees from behind the iron curtain, and that 30,000 of these refugees are now living in Sweden.

I very much regret that my remarks were interpreted as casting any reflection on the great and courageous people of Sweden or their fine government. I know how nobly they have stood up in the face of the Soviet terror and of the Soviet threat which is so near to them and hence so much more terrible. I commend the Swedish Government with all my heart for its bold stand in giving haven to these refugees whom the Soviet Government would like to get back in order to send them to slave-labor camps or worse.

However, the individuals who fled to this country from Sweden, and for whom I sought to provide permanent residence, did have a very real and practical fear of being within such easy reach of the Soviet terror. Just across the border the iron curtain hangs. There is no telling what the future might hold, so these people came to the United States to seek refuge here. That refuge should and will, I hope, be granted.

In any event, I am sorry that anything I said in connection with the original introduction of this bill might have given the wrong impression about Sweden, that brave and stalwart country which defies the terror while living under its shadow.

SENATOR WHERRY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution expressing the sympathy and affection of the Senate to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has been absent from our sessions for some weeks because of illness. I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and adoption of the resolution. I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be happy to express their warm regards.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, KENNETH WHERRY, has demonstrated many times at this session of the Congress that he possesses a real spirit of co-operation and a real desire to expedite the business of the Senate by meeting in a gentlemanly manner all the difficulties which arise upon this floor. His candor, his frank and forthright expression of his views and the views of the minority, his straightforward approach to all questions, are qualities which have endeared him to me.

While he has always maintained very strongly the rights of the minority, he has very seldom allowed partisan considerations to interfere with the necessary work of the Senate. I have been happy to have him just across the aisle from me, and I have missed him greatly in the weeks of his absence. It is my fervent hope that he will soon be well again, and that he will soon be raising his powerful voice in this Chamber.

I know that all Members of the Senate join me in sending him our best wishes and our prayers for his swift recovery and his return to the fellowship of this body.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas our deeply respected and widely admired colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska, has recently been compelled to remain absent from the deliberations of the Senate, due to illness; and

Whereas the Senate, like his fellow countrymen, has a high regard for his ability, his energy, his integrity, and his devotion to the public service as minority leader of this body; and

Whereas the action by the Senate in making known the esteem and affection in which he is held by his colleagues may hasten his recovery and his return to his post among us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the junior Senator from Nebraska be informed of the unanimous and wholehearted wish of the Senate for his complete and rapid recovery from his illness; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to convey the sense of this resolution, suitably expressed and inscribed, to the junior Senator from Nebraska, together with the cordial regards of all Members of this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I should like to join the majority leader in presenting the resolution which has just been unanimously adopted, concerning the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY]. If the Senator from Arizona does not object, I should like to do that in order that the resolution may express the views of the minority party as well as of the majority party.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am most happy to have the distinguished Senator's name on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution has already been adopted, and it will probably have to be reconsidered, in order to have that done.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the name be inserted in the resolution, as though it had not been previously adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no Member of the Senate who

has given more liberally of his energies and abilities to the work of his office than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. He has literally worn himself out, and I believe that that is one of the causes of his present ill health. I know we all wish him well. I am confident he will be in his accustomed place as the minority leader when the Senate reconvenes in January. When I say that we earnestly wish him a speedy recovery, and we congratulate him upon the service he has rendered to the Senate of the United States, I know I express the sentiment and feeling of every Senator on the minority side.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR MCFARLAND AND SENATOR WHERRY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for one minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico may proceed for one minute and a half.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are about to conclude the work of the Senate for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. I feel duty-bound to express what I believe to be the consensus of opinion of the majority, namely, that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has done a wonderful and most useful work as majority leader. He has just finished his first session as majority leader. I am sure his leadership has been patriotic, loyal, and in every sense American, and all of it under very trying circumstances. I hope he and his fine family obtain a much needed rest during the short adjournment.

Mr. President, I also wish to pay tribute to the minority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Although we of the majority may not always see eye to eye with him, nevertheless we respect his opinions and his sincerity of purpose. We hope and pray that he will soon be restored to full health.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very glad to say a word in addition to what the Senator from New Mexico has just said in paying tribute to the leadership of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and also in paying tribute, in connection with the resolution adopted a few minutes ago, to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, a Senator can speak at this time only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I apologize.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOEY AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Mississippi may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this session of the Senate has been termed by some an investigating session. We have had many investigations, and many Members of the Senate could be compli-

mented for the way they have conducted those investigations. I shall mention very briefly two Senators who have especially impressed me in connection with the investigations. My reference to these two Members of the Senate certainly should not be regarded as a failure on my part to recognize the fine work done by other Senators.

I wish to refer with particular appreciation, Mr. President, as a Member of this body to the splendid work done by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] in conducting the many investigations he has carried on here, particularly during this year. He brings to those investigations an atmosphere of judicial fairness, coupled with a high personal and official integrity which inspires confidence among his colleagues and among the people of this great Nation. In addition, he is trained in the law and has a fine mind which is vigorously and consistently devoted to thoroughness and impartiality of the very highest order. He has worked long hours without the fanfare of publicity nor the desire for same and has analyzed and presented the evidence and reports with care and with an impartiality that rises above persons and party. The result is an abiding confidence in his work and that of the subcommittee by the Members of the Senate and by the people of the Nation.

I commend the senior Senator from North Carolina for his splendid contribution in the work of the Senate.

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from North Carolina was not aware that I would make these remarks; I am making them in official capacity as a United States Senator and in appreciation of the very fine work he has done with impartiality, fairness, and a splendid judicial approach. He is rendering a great service to the Nation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have only 2 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer especially to the work of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. His RFC investigation, to my mind, is one of the outstanding events in the Congress in the past several years. While he was under what I would call an attack by the executive department of the Government he stood his ground and did his duty with a detached impersonal approach and a detached fairness and thereby carried out, I believe, the best and very highest traditions of the legislative branch of the Government. The investigation he carried on and the exposures he made are of untold benefit to the welfare of the United States. Instead of yielding or compromising when unjustified criticisms were heaped upon his head he stood on principles and courageously exposed fact and conditions in Government which greatly needed correction.

I wish to commend him, as an official of the Nation and as one of the Members of the Senate, for the very fine approach he took and the work he did. Of course, this work was shared with the other members of the subcommittee, who share

in the credit. I desire to commend Senator FULBRIGHT for his leadership and members of the subcommittee for their efforts.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota if I have time in which to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HOEY, SENATOR FULBRIGHT, AND SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I be recognized in order that I may concur in what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has said?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this time a Senator can be recognized only by unanimous consent, for the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to consideration of the remaining bills on the calendar.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized for one-half a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered; and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to concur in the very able remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I desire to concur in what he has said about the admirable manner in which the two Senators to whom he referred, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], conducted the investigations of which they were in charge.

Mr. President, I should like to add but one other name, and that is the name of Senator RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, who deserves the highest commendation for the able and impartial manner in which, as chairman of two committees sitting jointly, he conducted the extensive hearings growing out of what is known as the MacArthur incident last spring.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make certain remarks, to extend about 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the tributes which have been paid here today have all been magnificently justified. I rise only to add a word to the sentiments spoken by the Senator from Minnesota regarding the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was rather an active member of the joint committee which conducted the hearings in the so-called MacArthur case. As chairman of the two committees sitting jointly the Senator from Georgia performed this most trying task and discharged this most exacting responsibility with an efficiency and a courtesy which will long be remembered, not only by those who participated in the investigation, but I dare suggest it will form a model for investigations to be conducted in the future by this body. The Senator from Georgia is an ornament to the Senate, and I certainly congratulate him upon his fine work.

ASSIGNMENT TO AND UTILIZATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OF ARMED FORCES FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is great concern among some of our Maryland people as to the possible implications of certain proposals scheduled to be presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its meeting in Paris next month regarding the assignment to, and the utilization by, the United Nations of Armed Forces from the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram from Mrs. John Frisch, chairman of the Minute Women of Maryland, and other citizens who are protesting the proposed action by this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, Md.

HON. HERBERT O'CONOR,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Minute Women personally delivered to A. J. Bourbon, your administrative assistant, on October 9, a copy of the Acheson plan showing the plan to put our Armed Forces under the United Nations. An emergency such as in Egypt would give the General Assembly of the United Nations the power to put the United States in war as already demonstrated in Korea. The United Nations agenda calls for a vote to be taken to establish a collective measures committee who will designate an executive military authority to command all United Nations forces in the event of an emergency. The question of the establishment of the international military authority should be faced by the Senate before the vote is taken in Paris by the General Assembly next month. We believe this to be the life or death decision of our great Nation and are counting on you to accomplish this important message as our representative.

Mrs. John Frisch, Chairman, Minute Women of Maryland, United States of America; Virginia Star Freedom, Chairman, Against Un-American Activities, National Society of Maren Duval Descendants; Harry J. Moores, Talbot T. Speer (publisher), John Logan Campbell, Representative, Kiwanis Club and Maryland Action Guild, Baltimore; William Henry Evans, Jr.; Ex-Naval Lt. Edwin H. Cole; Josephine H. Holloway; Charles M. Stewart, Jr.

INQUIRY AS TO PRINTING IN THE RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. What is the proper form in which to make a request to have miscellaneous matters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following the coming adjournment of the Congress?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no particular formula. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that in an edition of the RECORD which will be printed following the adjournment, certain matters, which will be specified, shall be printed.

Mr. CAIN. It is then necessary to specify the matters to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is the proper rule.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

AID TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a half minute in which to make a brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, recently the Senate was told that we should not pass S. 337, the bill which would enable our medical, dental, and nursing schools to enroll and train the greatly increased number of doctors and nurses this country needs. We were told that our defense budget is so huge that we cannot afford to spend the relatively insignificant amount called for by this bill.

Mr. President, I believe that such so-called economy is not economy at all. It is pure, unadulterated waste. The fact is, Mr. President, that if we fail to make this necessary expenditure, we shall not only be wasting billions but we shall also be endangering the entire defense effort.

Because it so thoroughly explains and supports my reasoning—which is that of the majority of your Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—I ask unanimous consent to set forth at this point in the RECORD a brief article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times, and which explains with great clarity the direct relationship between our supply of doctors and nurses and the success of our defense effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH GUARDS FOR WORKERS LACKING IN UNITED STATES MOBILIZATION—COSTLY SICKNESS ABSENTEEISM DEMANDS HIGH PRIORITIES FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

The Nation has been warned repeatedly in the last few weeks that despite the truce talks in Korea there can be no let-down in defense mobilization. Since the economic requirements of our military program are predicated upon basic security needs and not upon developments in any particular area, our build-up in military strength, obviously, must continue as planned.

In the second quarter of this year defense production accounted for 10 percent of our gross national output. To reach our mobilization objectives, however, it will be necessary to double this ratio. This will require not only more workers in the labor force, but increased efficiency and output by each individual worker.

One of the greatest factors in individual worker output is health. Sickness absenteeism in industry now claims 400,000,000 to 500,000,000 man-days a year, with an estimated \$4,200,000,000 loss in earnings to workers and a corresponding loss of production and profits.

Experience, however, has shown these losses can be greatly reduced through adequate in-plant medical services. During World War II sickness absenteeism rates in industrial plants with inadequate or poor medical services varied from 4 to 6 percent

daily as compared to 2 to 3 percent in plants where good medical services were available. A number of companies have reported that the introduction of good industrial health services in peacetime has reduced sickness absenteeism by one-third.

INTEREST IN WORKER NOT NEW

American industry has been concerned with the health of its workers since the first industrial workplace in the Colonies, a glass-bottle factory, was established in Jamestown, Va., in 1607 to manufacture glass baubles and trinkets for trade with the Indians. As early as 1776, Benjamin Franklin asserted that the West India gripe was lead colic, due to drinking Jamaica rum made in stills in which the heads and coils were made of lead. As a result, the Massachusetts Legislature prohibited the use of lead still heads and worms. It was not until 1837, however, that the first scientific paper on industrial medicine was published by the Medical Society of the State of New York. Its author was Dr. Benjamin W. McCready, later one of the founders of the Bellevue Hospital Medical College and of the New York Academy of Medicine.

As industry has grown and become more complex, the problems of employee health have multiplied and industrial health can now be defined as the science and art of preserving health through the recognition, evaluation, and control of environmental causes and sources of illness in industry."

As Dr. Anthony L. Lanza, of New York University, a leading authority in industrial medicine, has said, industrial medicine involves the application of two skills—medicine and engineering. It is concerned with the environment of the industrial worker as well as with the effects of that environment upon his physical and mental structure.

It is difficult to estimate the cost of a good industrial health program for any one industry, as costs vary with the size, hazards, and health needs of the establishment and the quality and scope of the services given.

Unfortunately, the great majority of workers today are employed in plants that have little or no medical services except routine preemployment physical examinations. About 70 to 75 percent of the Nation's workers are employed in the 99 percent of the Nation's industrial plants that have less than 500 employees. These plants do not, for the most part, employ physicians. Most depend entirely on their insurance companies for medical and surgical care of injured employees and little about preventive health services.

As with many other health services, the key to the provision of the industrial health services that will be needed if we are to meet our production goals is the training of personnel. Today there are only about 2,000 full-time industrial physicians in the Nation, 13,133 industrial nurses (as compared to 300 prior to World War II) and 650 industrial hygiene engineers. To meet the increased needs of defense mobilization due to increased industrial activity and larger numbers of women, older-age and disabled workers entering the labor force, the Council on Industrial Medicine of the American Medical Association has estimated that we will need 1,600 more industrial physicians, 5,320 more industrial nurses, and 400 more industrial hygiene engineers.

The tragedy is that almost no physicians now are undergoing such training. Although six medical schools in the Nation offer excellent postgraduate courses in industrial medicine, some had no students last year and others but a small handful, most of whom were foreigners.

TWO REASONS FOR PREDICAMENT

There are two reasons for this. First, the income of most full-time salaried physicians is substantially less than that of those engaged in independent practice; and, second, young doctors are attracted to surgery, inter-

nal medicine, and the specialties in which they deal with the dramatic, acute phases of disease rather than prevention.

The recent widely publicized study on the income of physicians shows that although there are some notable exceptions in certain large industries, the incomes of industrial physicians as a group are not as large as those of physicians in private practice or in salaried positions in many of the other specialties. The survey showed that the average full-time salaried industrial physician had an annual net income of \$9,115. As a result, industrial practice has attracted but 1.1 percent of the full-specialized and 2.4 percent of the partly specialized physicians in the Nation.

As the services of this additional trained personnel are as essential to defense as is the production of armament itself, methods for meeting this should be given similarly high priorities. Our Nation's industrial workers cannot give their full potential to defense with finger-wrapping, first-aid type medical services.

AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO MAKE COMMITMENTS TO PURCHASE CERTAIN MORTGAGES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages which was read twice by its title.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill, which has just been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the words "provision of", it is proposed to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "subparagraphs (C) and."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall appreciate it if the Senator will repeat his statement. I was detained in conversation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may explain to the Senator that this bill has just been passed by the House. I understand it had the support of both Mr. Wolcott, whom I believe sponsored it in the committee, and Mr. SPENCE. It is in the nature of an amendment to the National Housing Act, to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into advance commitment contracts, with a proviso:

That not to exceed \$3,500,000 of said authorization shall be available for such commitments in any one State.

It is a very short bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the House committee's report, and the draft of the report I intended to make for the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2290.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report and the draft of the intended Senate report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT No. 1221

The Committee on Banking and Currency to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into advance commitments to purchase FHA section 213 mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued, prior to June 29, 1951, a commitment to insure or a statement of eligibility. The amount of advance purchase commitments which the Federal National Mortgage Association would be authorized to make would be limited to \$30,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and provision is further made that not more than \$3,500,000 of said authorization would be available for such commitments in any one State.

This prohibition against advance commitments is not applicable to mortgages (1) covering defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued a commitment to insure pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, or (3) covering housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster.

Paragraph (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, generally prohibits the Federal National Mortgage Association from entering into commitments to purchase eligible mortgages unless the mortgage is insured or guaranteed at the time of the contract.

Section 213 of the National Housing Act was enacted into law in April 1950. It provides a medium for the insurance of veterans cooperatives through which, by banding together in a common venture, veterans would be able to secure adequate housing at substantial savings. Although this program is a recent one, substantial interest in its benefits has culminated in the commencement of several cooperative housing projects. Several hundreds of veterans have invested down payments amounting to as much as \$1,200 per veteran in these housing projects and have subsequently been unable to derive any benefits due to the fact that mortgage money has not been available to finance the completion of the projects. This legislation would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase the definitive mortgage and thus enable the veteran to secure the financing necessary for the construction of their projects. Your committee has been advised that some 3,000 people would be the direct beneficiaries of the proposed legislation. In view of the hardship faced by these veterans who have invested a substantial amount of money to acquire a home for their families, your committee recommends the enactment of this legislation which will insure the projects being carried forward to completion.

ADVANCE MORTGAGE PURCHASE COMMITMENTS
BY THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSO-
CIATION WITH RESPECT TO COOPERATIVE
HOUSING

(Report to accompany S. 2290)

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2290) to

amend the National Housing Act to let the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase section 213 mortgages, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Section 301 of the National Housing Act prohibits the Federal National Mortgage Association (with certain exceptions) from purchasing or agreeing to purchase any mortgage if the original principal amount exceeds or exceeded \$10,000 per family unit or if the loan is not an existing loan insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration. These limitations may be found in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act. With respect to certain cooperative housing projects which the FHA would insure under section 213 of the National Housing Act, S. 2290 would waive these limitations, thereby permitting the FNMA to enter into advance commitment contracts to purchase mortgage loans which might exceed \$10,000 per family unit and which would not be insured by the FHA prior to the advance commitment. Such mortgages, however, would be required to be insured by the FHA prior to actual purchase by the FNMA. Under the bill, not more than \$30,000,000 of such advance commitment contracts could be outstanding and not more than \$3,500,000 could relate to mortgages covering property in any one State. The bill also limits such advance commitment contracts to mortgages related to projects for which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued a "statement of eligibility" prior to June 29, 1951.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to relieve severe hardship which has resulted for many FHA-aided cooperative housing projects. In accordance with congressional policy and directives contained in the Housing Act of 1950 and earlier legislation, these projects received special FHA mortgage insurance aids. At the time when the projects were undertaken, these aids, along with the general availability of residential mortgage funds, appeared sufficient to assure their ultimate financing even without the availability of advance FNMA mortgage purchase commitments. After considerable expenditures had been made for organization and legal expenses, land acquisition and improvement, and partial construction, many of the cooperatives found that a sudden national shortage of mortgage funds had left them in a position where they could not complete their projects.

The general shortage of mortgage funds which occurred early this year, after the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board agreed to a change in the policy governing support for Government bonds, affected the entire residential mortgage market. However, cooperative housing, which was just beginning to gain recognition and acceptance in financial circles as a result of the encouragement provided by the Housing Act of 1950, was hit with much greater severity than more established forms of residential financing. Cooperatives organized to build individual homes, the titles to which would be transferred to the individual co-operators, were particularly hard hit.

Cooperative projects which have received FHA certificates of eligibility on or after June 29, 1951, have not suffered the same severe degree of hardship since these projects have been required by the FHA to obtain prior assurances of financing. However, unless relief is afforded for the earlier projects, severe losses will be suffered by the cooperatives and their members. A high percentage of the membership of FHA-aided cooperatives are veterans and their families. Unless relief is afforded along the lines of S. 2290, the basic purpose of the aid which the Con-

gress has previously made available for pioneer cooperative housing projects will be largely negated.

We have been informed by the Federal Housing Administration that the \$30,000,000 authorization for FNMA advance mortgage commitments would be sufficient, in the light of the limitation with respect to commitments in any one State, to furnish the necessary relief as intended by the bill. If in any one State, it is found that applications for advance commitments exceed the authorized amount, it is the view of your committee that preference should be given on the basis of the relative extent of the cooperatives' need and hardship. Thus, consideration could be given to such factors, among others, as the relative danger of financial loss, the amount of expenditures already made by the cooperative, the extent to which construction has advanced, and the degree of hardship which would be suffered by individual members of the cooperative if the advance commitment is not made available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment would simply include another paragraph. The bill will have to go back to the House after we place the amendment in it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the Senator explain very briefly the purpose of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the House report and the draft of the report I intend to file here. I believe I can explain rather briefly the bill without reading the reports. At the time of the passage of section 213, to provide a cooperative housing program, it was assumed that 4 percent interest rate would be sufficient to induce capital to purchase mortgages and up to the spring of this year our assumption appeared justified. Since then, however, largely because of the change in the policy of the Federal Reserve Board with reference to the support of the Government bond market, the mortgage market has tightened up considerably and section 213 mortgages, which the mortgage market is relatively unfamiliar with, were very difficult to sell. A number of cooperative housing projects had received eligibility statements from the FHA prior to June 29, 1951. There are many veterans involved in the projects, and the report of the House committee states that many veterans have paid down as much as \$1,200, and now they are unable to sell their mortgages because of the tight mortgage market. The bill authorizes "Fannie May" to make advance commitments to purchase not more than \$30,000,000 worth of mortgages for the whole country and no more than \$3,500,000 in any one State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the bill does, then, is to provide for an extension to \$30,000,000 throughout the whole country, because of the ruling of the Federal Reserve Board—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry. The Federal Reserve Board is in no way involved. I merely cited that as one of the causes of the tightness in the mortgage market. The bill does not change the interest rate. All it does is to authorize "Fannie May" to obligate its own funds for this amount. It furnishes a market up to \$30,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is because the interest rate on mortgage loans has gone higher since the change in regulations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It simply means that investors are not so much interested in purchasing these mortgages as they were prior to that change. A year ago, when the bill was passed, mortgages of this kind could be disposed of more readily. The change in the money market has made them unattractive. The bill applies only to those projects for which eligibility statements were issued by FHA prior to June 29, 1951. Mr. President, I should like to point out before concluding, as I did in the report I intended to make for the committee on this bill, if in any one State, it is found that applications for advance commitments exceed the authorized amount, it is the view of the Committee on Banking and Currency that preference should be given on the basis of the relative extent of the cooperatives' need and hardship. Thus, consideration could be given to such factors, among others, as the relative danger of financial loss, the amount of expenditures already made by the cooperative, the extent to which construction has advanced, and the degree of hardship which would be suffered by individual members of the cooperative if the advance commitment is not made available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes whereby the bill (H. R. 5745) was passed, the amendment to it was ordered to be engrossed, the bill was ordered to a third reading, and also the vote by which my amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The bill (H. R. 5745) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the first bill which was passed over.

WITHHOLDING OF PATENTS DETRIMENTAL TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. McCARRAN] that as I view it, the bill denies the relief provided by section 3 to persons who at the time of making claim, or at the time of invention, are employed by the United States. I wish to offer an amendment

which would limit this denial of relief to persons employed full time at the time of invention. Thus the amendment would remove as bars to relief employment at the time of making claim, or part-time employment at the time of invention.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is offering an amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am. I was going to ask the distinguished Senator if he has a copy of the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have a copy of the amendment; and, so far as I have authority to do so, I would accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas offers an amendment which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 13, after the word "representative", it is proposed to strike out "who, when he makes a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or", and in line 14, after the word "the", to insert "full-time".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 19, after the word "Claims", it is proposed to insert "or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such claimant is a resident".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment has a single purpose, and a very simple one. Under the language of the bill as reported from committee, a claimant is given the right to sue in the Court of Claims, to recover just compensation for the damage caused him and the reasonable value, if any, of the use of the invention by the Government. It has been pointed out that it might be a severe inconvenience on some claimants to have to come to Washington to prosecute their claims in the Court of Claims; and it has been suggested that the right should be given to bring an action in the United States district court for the district in which the claimant is a resident.

Force was lent to this argument by the fact that in the recently-passed Mutual Security Act of 1951, the right of a claimant to sue in his own Federal district court as well as in the Court of Claims, was preserved.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, the purpose of which is to give the same right under this bill that is given under

the Mutual Security Act of 1951, namely, the right of a claimant to bring his action either in the Court of Claims or in the United States district court for the district of which he is a resident.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to write into permanent law provisions relative to patents. This bill will grant to the Secretary of Commerce under certain conditions the authority to keep inventions secret and to withhold the issue of a patent when necessary for the national security.

The first act of this nature was the act of October 6, 1917. In 1940 Public Law 700 was enacted to make the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917, effective for 2 years. In 1942 Public Law 609 was enacted to keep Public Law 700 in effect during World War II. Thus it will be seen we have had a number of temporary acts relating to the withholding of patents.

The existing world situation, together with the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the possibility of a treaty with Germany, indicates that these temporary laws will soon become of no force and effect. It is, therefore, necessary, in order to protect the security of the United States as it may be affected by the disclosure of patents, that positive legislation be enacted for this purpose.

This legislation provides for an appeal to the Secretary of Commerce by a patentee. It provides for the right of a patentee to sue in the Court of Claims for damages for the withholding of his patent and provides for reasonable compensation for the use of this patent. This latter provision may also be litigated in the Court of Claims in order to determine just compensation.

After careful study of the proposed legislation, which was the result of hearings in the House, the committee was of the opinion that this bill is meritorious and should be considered favorably.

Mr. President, there is one section of this bill with respect to which the representatives of the Minority Policy Committee, the Republican Calendar Committee, have made a suggestion. This is the section of the bill having to do with precluding court action by Federal employees, against the Government, with respect to patent matters dealt with under this bill.

It was the view of the Minority Calendar Committee, as I understand it, that this provision is unduly harsh.

After this point had been raised by the Minority Calendar Committee, I had the matter taken up with the National Inventors Council, so as to get an expert opinion; and I found in that organization a measure of concurrence with the view expressed by the Minority Calendar Committee.

Accordingly, I have expressed my willingness to assent to an amendment which would make this provision less restrictive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 1045) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill in relation to what it does, because it has been before the Senate previously, and I understand it was vetoed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would pay the sum of \$7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C. The death of the decedent resulted from an accident caused by the negligence of fellow employees at the Norfolk naval shipyard during wartime, according to the finding of the naval investigating officer.

The question of contributory negligence suggested by the facts in this case has been resolved in favor of the claimant by the committee, upon review of the law of Virginia which is the jurisdiction wherein the accident occurred.

The Department of the Navy, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice oppose enactment of this bill upon consideration of the bill in reference to the limitations on recovery in such a case under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The committee is of the opinion that this petition for redress of grievances should not be so narrowly considered, and upon consideration of all the circumstances recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1045) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of \$7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ESTATE OF CARLOS M. COCHRAN

The bill (S. 1097) for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Reserving the right to object, I note that there are some unusual characteristics involved in this measure. May we have an explanation of it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for payment of the sum of \$5,000 to the estate of Carlos M. Cochran of Miami, Fla. The decedent met

his death while serving as a private in the Army at a training base in this country during wartime.

The decedent was suffering some mental disability, and on the day of his death was apprehended by a gate sentry just beyond the boundaries of the training base. The decedent escaped the custody of the gate sentry and started to run away. The gate sentry commanded him to halt, and when the command was disregarded the gate sentry fired his weapon, a shotgun, directly at the fleeing man; one pellet from the shotgun blast went through his heart, killing him instantly.

The Department of the Army and the Department of Justice recommended that the bill be not favorably considered. However, the committee is of the opinion that the decedent met his death through the wrongful use of excessive and unwarranted force by the gate sentry involved, in the attempt by the latter to maintain custody of the decedent, and therefore the committee recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I know that the Committee on the Judiciary has given most careful consideration to this measure, and, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Nevada feels that there are certain circumstances involved which would really take this bill out of the category of a measure establishing a precedent which might well be considered to be wide open.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter of establishing a precedent in passing a bill of this kind was a most serious question with the Committee on the Judiciary. After a long and careful study of the bill it was the judgment of the committee that it would not establish a precedent because of the peculiar nature of the circumstances surrounding the incident.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I appreciate that statement of the chairman of the committee as a matter of record which might be looked back to later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1097) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Carlos M. Cochran, late of Miami, Fla., the sum of \$5,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of the death of the said Carlos M. Cochran in line of duty, while he was serving as private first class, in the military forces of the United States (XC-311193), when he was shot by a sentry at the north auxiliary gate on Highway No. 98 at Tyndall Field, Fla., on December 19, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and

upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next bill sent to the foot of the calendar for consideration today.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I am compelled to object to this measure, and ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MARK G. RUSHMANN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, this is one of the bills which went to the foot of the calendar for consideration today. I merely wish to state that, in my judgment, the bill establishes such a wide-open precedent that it is one which should receive most careful consideration before it is passed. Therefore I think it should not be passed at this time on the call of the calendar, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

INCOME TAXES ON GAINS ON INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3590) relating to the income-tax treatments of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 6, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "assessed." and insert "assessed."; after line 5, to insert:

This subsection shall not apply, in the case of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, if the destruction, theft, seizure, requisition, or condemnation of residence, or the sale or exchange of such residence under threat or imminence thereof, occurred after December 31, 1950."

And in line 12, to reletter the subsection from "(e)" to "(f)."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the amendment reported to the bill is a technical amendment which was carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Finance. There is no objection to the bill as such, but the technical amendment necessarily will send the bill back to the House. The Senator from Connecticut has another amendment which I think he wishes to offer to the bill, to which there is likewise no objection, because it presents the strange situation of a taxpayer asking that the excise taxes on his property remain in effect

until next April 1, although under the tax bill passed yesterday excise taxes were taken off altogether. The question of floor stocks is involved, and the problem is presented since the purchasers and merchants who deal in electric heating pads have some on hand. Therefore I agreed to accept the amendment. Is the Senator from Connecticut ready to offer it?

Mr. PENTON. Mr. President, I call up the amendment, and I am very grateful for the understanding shown by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in view of the fact that the heating-pad industry largely centers in the State of Connecticut, and the additional revenue to the Treasury is estimated to amount to as much as \$350,000.

May I have unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement I have prepared regarding the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would not the Senator like to offer the amendment first?

Mr. BENTON. I thought I had offered the amendment. I do offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 10, after the word "by" insert "the first two sections of".

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 490 of the Revenue Act of 1951, the effective date of so much of the amendment made by section 485 of such act to section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as relates to electric heating pads shall be April 1, 1952.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, observing a distinguished former newspaperman now presiding, I call his attention to the saying that when a man bites a dog it is news. Most certainly this is the first time I ever heard a man asking that taxes imposed on him should not be removed, but should be kept in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut that his statement be printed in the Record at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

When a man bites a dog—and when a businessman asks Congress not to repeal his taxes—that's news.

So I am arising, Mr. President, to offer an amendment to H. R. 3590 that will retain the 10 percent excise tax on heating pads until April 1, 1952.

This levy is repealed in the tax bill we have just enacted. But the heating-pad industry, which is centered in Connecticut, has asked Senator McMAHON and me to help them keep the tax in effect for another 4 months.

It has been estimated for me that this will mean an additional yield to the Government of \$350,000 in revenue. I cannot vouch for this figure. Manifestly it means revenue and just how much must depend on volume of sales.

The problem stems from the fact that the tax bill repealed contains no provision for floor-stock refunds in dealers' inventories on which the tax has already been paid.

Tens of thousands of dollars will be lost to the manufacturers unless some relief is provided, because approximately 75 percent of the entire year's business has been shipped within the past 90 days. Under the new tax bill, dealers will look to the manufacturers for refunds on the unsold goods in inventory, and the losses to manufacturers would be very serious in view of the fact that the Treasury will not underwrite such refunding.

In the winter season is the time when 90 percent of the pads are sold and a delay in removing the tax thus would reduce losses through refunds to a minimum that could be borne by the industry.

In view of the benefit to the Government and the correction of an inequity to the industry, I feel this amendment should be favorably considered by the Senate.

H. R. 3590 amends section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property.

PROPOSED RELIEF TO ELECTRIC HEATING PAD INDUSTRY IN CONNECTION WITH REMOVAL OF EXCISE TAX

The pending tax bill removes the 10 percent excise tax on electric heating pads, but contains no provision for floor-stock refunds on dealers' inventories on which the tax has already been paid. Tens of thousands of dollars will be lost to the industry unless some relief is provided, because approximately 75 percent of the entire year's business has been shipped within the last 90 days. Dealers will look to the manufacturers for refunds and the losses would be very serious.

Having been advised of the impossibility of amending the pending tax bill to include a floor stock tax refund, it is proposed that a special law be enacted postponing the effective date of bill as it applies to electric heating pads to April 30, 1952. The winter season is when 90 percent of the pads are sold, and a delay in the removal of the tax as above suggested, would reduce losses to a minimum, which could be borne by the industry.

Such action would result in additional revenue to the Government of upward of \$350,000.

The heating-pad industry has asked me to propose delaying the removal of the excise tax on electric heating pads to April 30, 1952. In view of the benefit to the Government and the correction of an inequity to the industry, I feel this amendment should be favorably considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to inquire whether any other amendment except that offered by the Senator from Connecticut has as yet been offered to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only the committee amendments, perfecting amendments, which have been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those amendments relate solely to the subject matter of the bill, do they not?

Mr. GEORGE. They are purely technical amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that there has been no substantial change in the bill from the manner in which it was reported by the committee, except with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; there has been no other change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. DORA TROOST

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have here a matter to which I draw the attention of the leaders on both sides, and I shall submit a unanimous-consent request.

There has come into my hand House bill 5397, which provides for the renaturalization of a woman who has been away from this country for some time. The purpose of the bill is to restore to Mrs. Dora Troost United States citizenship, notwithstanding any period of residence in a foreign state, provided that she returns to the United States for permanent residence within 1 year following the effective date of the act.

The beneficiary of the bill is a native of Mexico who was naturalized in the United States on November 28, 1945. She has three children who are United States citizens, all of whom are residing in the United States. She has been in the Netherlands West Indie with her husband for over 3 years, and is thereby considered to have lost her United States citizenship, by reason of such residence in a foreign country.

Therefore, Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report favorably without amendment a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost, and I submit a report (No. 1056) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what precedent this bill will create? If renaturalization is granted to a woman who has been out of the country for over 3 years, are there other cases which may be similar, and are such cases taken up individually? What is the practice?

Mr. McCARRAN. Every case stands on its own feet and on its own merits. This case would not be presented by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary at this time if, first of all, the facts of the case had not been examined thoroughly by the committee's staff; and, secondly, if we did not believe the case had sufficient merit so that it should be taken up out of the regular course and enacted at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, time is of such essence that the chairman of the committee is taking this unusual course.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection unless the calendar committee has objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we have checked this matter, and the calendar committee has no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO JOSEPH PICKETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "acres", it is proposed to insert "The prior disposition of the homestead lands of Joseph Pickett is hereby ratified and confirmed."

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, this amendment was suggested by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. For all practical purposes the bill without the amendment would probably clear up the situation. However, in view of the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, I think it would be best to adopt the amendment which he has suggested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What Assistant Secretary suggested the amendment?

Mr. ECTON. It is recommended by Assistant Secretary Dale E. Doty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment was not presented to the committee when the committee had the bill under consideration.

Mr. ECTON. No. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that that was an oversight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, there is no objection on the part of the Interior Department to the amendment.

Mr. ECTON. The Interior Department recommends the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LAURA A. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 3840) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LOUIS W. MILLIKIN

The bill (H. R. 4219) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Millikin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO URSULA RUTHERFORD OLLINGER

The bill (H. R. 4351) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO MARY RUTHERFORD SPEARSON

The bill (H. R. 4352) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 3937) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061) to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SABINE RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN TEXAS AND LOUISIANA

The bill (H. R. 4288) granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF GILA PUEBLO, ARIZONA, BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The bill (S. 2169) authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo in Globe County, Ariz., for archeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this bill involves some property near Globe, Ariz., known as the Gila Pueblo, which consists of several buildings in excellent condition. The buildings were erected by a private individual for archaeological purposes. They cost many times the price for which the Government can now obtain them. These buildings would constitute a fine monument for the Government. The property is valuable. I hope the Senator will not object to the Government having the advantage of this property at the price stipulated. I cannot see why there should be any objection to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I presume there is some merit in the request of the Senator from Arizona. However, the Senator from Arizona knows that the larger portion of the area of Arizona is in the hands of the Federal Government. All this bill would do would be to add more land to the holdings of the

Government, land which is possibly now on the tax rolls of Arizona. If it were transferred to the Federal Government it would be taken off the tax rolls. For that reason I do not see why the bill should pass by unanimous consent on the call of the calendar. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further withhold his objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. No one depreciates the idea of the Federal Government taking over private land holdings any more than does the junior Senator from Arizona, and particularly in Arizona where it already is the largest land owner. However, this property is of particular value to the State. Because of the archaeological history involved and the work which has been done in the past making this a noteworthy monument it is believed that this property will be more valuable to the State if it is placed in the hands of the Federal Government than it would be if it were to remain in private ownership. Of course, if we have to take the bill up in the regular order, we can do so, but the property will deteriorate that much more in the meantime.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say one further word. Once upon a time the State of New Mexico owned the Carlsbad National Monument. It was the property of the State of New Mexico. Foolishly we passed a bill similar to the bill which is now under discussion, and we have been sorry ever since. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The Clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN KINDS OF TWINE

The bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions with regard to the bill. As I understand, the bill would permit free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. My interest in it is that in Massachusetts there is located one of the largest factories for making twine in the country, the Plymouth Cordage Company. Other cordage companies are also interested.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia this question: Is not the definition of twine given in the bill very indefinite? I ask the question because I feel that there should be some protection given not only to the American manufacturer, who wants to be protected from the importation of cheaper grades of twine than the type he manufactures, but also to the American farmer, so that

he may buy imported twine, if he so desires, which would work in his combine, and not fall him.

I know that in the committee an amendment was offered to define twine, and I should like to read to the Senator from Georgia that definition, with the thought that possibly he could give me an idea as to whether it represents his interpretation of what the bill means. The definition is:

All binding twine and baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply, measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, treated to repel insects and rodents, and in the case of baler twine to resist mildew, and chiefly used in harvesting agricultural crops.

It is my understanding that if that definition of what it meant by baler twine were included it would be a very proper bill, because it would keep up the grade of the twine which would come into this country and be of value not only to the farmer but to the manufacturer also.

I would appreciate it very much if the chairman of the Committee on Finance would state whether the definition which I have read represents his understanding of what is meant by the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. A portion of that definition, of course, is provided in the law, and I call attention to paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1932. It reads as follows:

All binding twine—

That is the present law; the bill adds—and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials—

That is the only language added; then follows the remainder of section 1622—manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

Thus far the definition is prescribed by law. With reference to the oil content of the baler twine, I must frankly say that I do not know, except that from the actual use of the baler twine I should think that if it had no oil it would be a very inferior type of twine, and could not be easily used in the modern reaper, binder, combine, or other machines in which such twine is used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what the oil content should be under any proper definition.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The oil is the result of a treating process designed to keep insects away from the twine. If twine were not treated crickets would cut it the very first night it was put in the bundle or bale. Oil is used as a treating process to protect the twine from insects. The act has protected the producer and the user of the twine, so far as binding a bundle or bale is concerned. What is being done today is to keep pace with

progress in America, because the harvester has been replaced by the combine. In order to salvage the straw, the baler goes into the field and picks up the straw and bales it. It is a part of the revolution in agriculture. That was the only reason why producer and farm organizations have asked for the same consideration for baler twine as was extended to the binder twine in earlier years.

A bale can be bound with either wire or twine. Some farmers prefer twine, while others prefer wire. With this duty on the twine, of course, the cost of binding a bale is higher. Therefore, they have asked that the duty be waived.

Mr. GEORGE. I would think that in general the definition which was read by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would be the definition the customs officials would adopt. I am speaking generally, because I have no very definite knowledge about how the twine is treated and what the oil content is. I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that twine must have oil treatment in order to make it usable and in order to preserve it against rodents and insects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the purposes stated by the Senator from Minnesota. I use baler twine myself on my little place in Massachusetts. What I should like to emphasize as best I can is this: Do not the words "chiefly used for baling hay," and so forth, let down the whole restrictive content of paragraph 1622? I may say that when baler twine came in it would come in as a very inferior grade, if it were argued that it would be chiefly used for baling hay. That is what I should like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. GEORGE. I would say that the section is rather vague, but I believe the customs officials can be relied upon to define it in a way that would substantially agree with the definition which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that be true, I do not believe that the citizens of Massachusetts who are interested in this subject would have any great objection. Is it not true that a lawsuit will have to be brought or an interpretation made by the Customs Court in order to get a regulation interpreting the provision?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is correct. I think the Department will have to work out an interpretive regulation, which will probably be passed upon by the Customs Court. That was true in the case of binding twine when we put it into the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Georgia that such a ruling by the Customs Court should in substance carry out the definition I read and which the Senator feels is proper?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. I should say so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Under those circumstances I will not submit the definition I have read as an amendment to the bill, because we can get the same result by a Customs Court interpretation and a regulation based thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I received this morning from the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Farmers' Union, Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 20, 1951.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,

United States Senate:

Any proposed rider amendments to H. R. 1005 of unrelated nature are a threat to enactment of this vital legislation at this session of Congress. We hope you will oppose such moves and give the American farmer prompt relief in the supply of baler twine which is important in food production.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
NATIONAL GRANGE.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may correct a misstatement of mine?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said that my Massachusetts constituents would not object. Of course, they object to the bill, but, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, the bill is improved considerably.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that in connection with the consideration of the House bill, there was considerable discussion along the line of the amendment, or definition, or description the Senator from Massachusetts has just read. For his information, I may say that the four farm organizations whose telegrams were just placed in the RECORD, in connection with their endorsement of this measure, and the representatives of the Cordage Institute, as I understood, were practically in agreement on the definition the Senator read into the RECORD a few moments ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska, because I know he is interested in this matter, and I know he wants to have the best possible ball of twine made available, as does the Senator from Minnesota. So I hope the regulation will be interpreted in the proper way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1005) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacquelyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Eiden Joslin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 14, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 73, 87, 105, and 110, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3889. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District

of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution providing that the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 170) providing for the printing of 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 170, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," of which 3,000 copies shall be for the Senate Document Room, 30,000 copies for the House Document Room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Finance, and 1,500 copies for the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS—DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security; and I request the immediate consideration of the nomination. Mr. Bissell is to be next in authority to Mr. Harriman. We could not bring forward Mr. Bissell's nomination until Mr. Harriman's nomination had been confirmed. Therefore, I should like to have Mr. Bissell's nomination confirmed at this time, because the nomination is a very important one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

The question is, as in executive session, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I happen to know Mr. Bissell because he comes from Massachusetts. He has been Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and more recently he has served as Acting Administrator of the ECA. He is well-qualified for the new position to which he has been nominated. The confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harriman as Director for Mutual Security makes it important that the nomination of Mr. Bissell to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security be confirmed before the end of this session. I know of no objection to the nomination, and I see no reason why the nomination should not be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, now that we are proceeding as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the one nomination on the Executive Calendar be considered at this time, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF NARCOTICS LAWS

The bill (H. R. 3490) to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none; and, without objection—

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate to have this bill passed without having a brief comment made.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for and the benefits to be derived from more stringent legislation to curb the widespread traffic in narcotic drugs.

The recent Nation-wide indignation, which directly stems from investigations and hearings by the Senate Crime Committee, indicates the gravity of the problem.

When the Senate extended the life of our committee, and I was designated chairman, we made this problem our No.

1 assignment. Unfortunately, before that, only scant attention had been given this curse; and in those instances the activity was confined to a single locality. Our investigation was launched on a Nation-wide basis, and the revelations and disclosures were such that we concluded it was imperative that drastic action be taken.

Our Senate committee came to the conclusion that, first, the illicit traffic in narcotics constitutes an evil of such great proportions that, unless curbed, it will endanger the social structure of the United States and inflict irreparable harm to the youth of the Nation.

Second, the increase in the use by younger people of drugs has been shocking. Not only do the records of hospitals reveal this, but information gathered by the committee points unmistakably to the upward trend in this narcotic addiction.

Third, because the traffic in narcotic drugs pays high profits to the most depraved of the criminal elements, the peddlers are ready to wreck the lives of children in order to obtain the enormous income.

Fourth, penalties for violations must be increased. Short sentences do not act as a deterrent to the professional peddlers, and suspended sentences defeat the very purposes of the laws.

Our committee held hearings at the United States Public Health Service hospital at Lexington, Ky., and secured first-hand information as to the extent of this problem and the terrible results of addiction. Later we held public hearings, and the information that was disclosed proved conclusively that this problem is a challenging one. Unfortunately, some of the Federal courts in the past have not faced this situation realistically, and, as a result, short sentences have been imposed. The professional drug peddler responsible for the widespread use has been able to return to his illicit trade all too soon.

Our experience in the survey of criminal activities showed clearly that lengthy sentences imposed promptly after conviction of criminal offenses have a very salutary effect. The history of other instances of drastic legislation, both at the Federal level and at the State level, leaves no doubt that criminals are aware of this situation. Consequently, our committee took the lead in urging the enactment of legislation for lengthy sentences for this type of offense. I, as chairman of the committee which projected this Nation-wide effort, express the hope that this proposed legislation will be enacted and made effective forthwith, inasmuch as offenses of this type require lengthy prison sentences, in accordance with the provisions of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3490) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the passage of House bill 3490, Calendar No. 997, a bill amending the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, a brief statement, together with excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Anslinger, as to the great importance of that measure.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill (H. R. 3490) which is the same as the Senate bill 1695 filed by me and sponsored by Senators O'CONOR, HUNT, TOREY, and WILEY, the members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, is one of the most important proposals made in this session of Congress. Its enactment will put into effect recommendation No. 12 of the Senate Crime Committee as set forth in the third interim report. It sets up mandatory penalties for persons convicted of narcotic selling and other violations. Sentences after the first one cannot be suspended.

I shall not discuss the lives and homes wrecked by narcotic violators. It is one of the Nation's foremost problems. Mr. Anslinger, the very capable head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau, is doing an excellent job with the staff furnished him and with the weak laws now on the statute books. He feels and the Crime Committee feel that this mandatory-penalty law was the one most needed piece of legislation in the effort against the narcotic peddlers.

The Senate Crime Committee in its third interim report has this to say as to the need for this legislation:

"XII. THE PENALTIES AGAINST THE ILLEGAL SALE, DISTRIBUTION, AND SMUGGLING OF NARCOTIC DRUGS SHOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED

"We have seen that there has been a serious increase in the narcotics traffic, particularly among teen-agers. One of the ways to curb that traffic is through the imposition of severe penalties. Mr. Harry Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, testified before this committee that—

"The average prison sentence meted out in the Federal courts is 18 months. Short sentences do not deter. In districts where we get good sentences the traffic does not flourish. * * * Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have recommended more severe sentences as one of the best methods to suppress the traffic.

"In many countries that has been very effective.

"There should be a minimum sentence for the second offense. The commercialized transaction, the peddler, the smuggler, those who traffic in narcotics, on the second offense if there were a minimum sentence of 5 years without probation or parole, I think it would just about dry up the traffic."

"In the light of this testimony, Congress should pass legislation to provide for increased penalties for drug peddlers and others engaged in the commercialized aspects of the drug traffic. Mandatory penalties of imprisonment of at least 5 years should be provided for second offenders. Such legislation is now pending in the House of Representatives where it is receiving the careful consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means."

Following this report S. 1695 was filed by the junior Senator from Tennessee on June 18. Meantime Congressman Boggs had filed and was pushing for passage of this legisla-

tion in the House of Representatives. Congressman Boggs, Senator GEORGE and their associates on the Ways and Means and Finance Committees are to be congratulated on bringing this legislation to final passage.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD AND ZINC

The bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire as to the particular reason for the consideration of this measure at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill should be considered in connection with another one, which I have before me at this time.

Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I now ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, House bill 5448, to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; and I submit a report—No. 1057—thereon. House bill 5448 was considered by the House of Representatives, and would have reached the Senate some days earlier, but for the exacting work required to be done on the 1951 Tax Act.

Mr. President, House bill 5448 is in almost exactly the same position as House bill 4948; and at this time I wish to call attention to the facts in regard to both those bills, the lead bill and the zinc bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House bill 5448 will be received and will be placed on the calendar, and will be reached later.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that both the general counsel in the Office of Defense Mobilization and Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Director, are concerned about these two bills, both the lead bill and the zinc bill, the lead bill now being before the Senate. They advised the committee that there was a shortage of lead, and it was necessary to procure additional quantities of lead in connection with the war effort and the defense program.

Mr. Howard Young, the Deputy Director of the Defense Materials Purchasing Administration, of which Mr. Jess Larson is Administrator, called me yesterday with reference to both the zinc bill and the lead bill. His purpose in calling was to suggest that the zinc bill be added to the lead bill, by way of amendment. However, in the meantime the House acted on the zinc bill, which has just been reported.

Mr. Howard Young stated that he is from the zinc industry itself, and knows the industry and knows that the industry is most anxious to have this duty temporarily suspended. He stated that it was most important that that be done.

Personally I do not know Mr. Young; but he is said to be the head of the Metals Purchasing Administration under Mr. Larson, as I have stated, and is president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of St. Louis, Mo., which has a dozen or more zinc mines throughout the country, and is one of the largest producers.

He testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, in executive hearing, on the zinc bill; and he stated that he is on leave from his company, but that he also was speaking for the lead industry and the zinc industry. He urged the passage of both bills. The bills do not completely suspend the duty, I may say to the distinguished Senator, because both the bills contain this provision:

Provided, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of slab zinc—

I am now reading the zinc provision, because it is substantially the same as the lead provision—

(prime western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) for that month has been below 18 cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under paragraphs 77, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation.

In determining the average market price of slab zinc for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of slab zinc (prime western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's Metal and Mineral Markets.

That same provision in substance is inserted in the lead bill, except, I believe, that the markets for lead are New York and New Jersey. These matters were pressed upon both the Ways and Means and Finance Committees by Mr. Wilson's office and Mr. Larson's office. That is the only available information I have.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether these bills have been considered at hearings held by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. The bills have been considered by the committee, but we had no testimony further than the testimony which was submitted to the House committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this legislation is but a continuation of the principle of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which puts into the hands of the Secretary of State the right to remake the industrial map of the United States and to favor foreign production over local or domestic production. It admits to the taxpayers of America that their money will be invested in the foreign exploration and development of new deposits and new supplies of zinc and lead.

These items would join the long list of free trade items. Private money will not be invested in new exploration and development of ores in America unless there is a floor under wages and investments because it is almost certain that as soon as the emergency is over such investment would be destroyed.

Mr. President, the same thing happened in regard to copper. The same principle is involved. The junior Senator from Nevada in the debate on that

subject said that very soon the Government would be paying 2½ or 3 cents more for foreign copper than for domestic copper; and that has happened. This paying of more for foreign copper began immediately after the duty was removed and within 3 weeks after the junior Senator from Nevada made the prediction on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, with our taxpayer's money, the Government even makes loans for the exploration and development of new ores in foreign countries.

Our taxpayers' money is being misused in financing business ventures which should be financed with private capital.

If we would adopt the principle of a fair and reasonable competitive market in this country for the goods of other nations, private investors would then know that there would be a floor under their investments and sufficient private capital would be available.

In connection with these bills offered, I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the Government does not pay duty on anything coming into this country used for national defense, if the Government buys it. I point out further that if a private concern should buy abroad and use such material in the manufacture of war goods which are subsequently sold to the Government, the Government would collect the duty, then pay the duty, which would amount to no duty being paid, making no difference whatever.

What the proposed legislation does is to upset the entire economic situation of the United States of America, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard by the Senator from Nevada, and the bill will go over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to refer to Calendar No. 779 (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two more bills yet to be called.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reserve my request.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the objection? I wanted to make inquiry as to whether the objection was made to the zinc bill, also.

Mr. MALONE. Yes, and not only to zinc and lead, but to every other item proposed for similar treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The zinc bill has not been called up.

Mr. GEORGE. I so understand.

CANAL FROM CAPE MAY HARBOR TO DELAWARE BAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill, by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. The bill (H. R. 4055) to authorize for an additional 1-year period, the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. Where are we now? Have we disposed of the zinc, or is it yet to come?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The zinc bill is yet to be called on the calendar. We are now on Calendar 999, House bill 4055. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF ZINC

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one more bill remaining, which was placed on the calendar by unanimous consent, known as the zinc bill. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. The bill (H. R. 5448) to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether I correctly understood him to say that the industry, that is, the producers of zinc and lead, are favorable to both this measure and the one relating to lead, which was objected to by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GEORGE. I am so advised. Only within the week a ceiling price has been placed upon both lead and zinc, and the industry regards both these measures as advisable. But, of course, the Senator from Nevada having objected to the lead bill, I merely inquired whether he also desired to make objection to the zinc bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator understand that I mean the producers of lead and zinc, not these who use those products in industry? Are they favorable to these measures? In other words, are the operators of the lead mines and the zinc mines favorable to these measures? That is what I should like to know?

Mr. GEORGE. No objections have been made by any of the producers. Mr. Howard Young, president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., St. Louis, which has more than a dozen zinc and lead mines throughout the country, and which is one of the largest producers, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, and in executive session, that the producers themselves desired the passage of these bills.

Mr. WATKINS. The reason I am calling it to the attention of the Senator is that I have not received, so far as I recall, any communication from Utah mines with respect to either of these bills. Were hearings held before the Senate committee?

Mr. GEORGE. The bills were called and there was no objection. Purely technical matters were inquired into. The committee took no testimony.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator sure that the producers in these fields knew of this proposed legislation?

Mr. GEORGE. I am quite sure they did know of it. I have read what Mr. Young himself said. He is now the President of the Metal Marketing Division in Mr. Larsen's organization, and he is also connected with making loans to the lead and zinc industry.

Mr. WATKINS. If the producers do not object, I shall not object to either of these bills.

Mr. GEORGE. I have received not one word of objection to either of the bills. Nothing has reached the committee to indicate that there was objection. The committee itself made an amendment to the lead bill to bring it more into line with the recently established ceiling prices which have been raised on both lead and zinc.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] a question with reference to these measures?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Utah may inquire of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from Nevada aware of the fact that the producers are quite agreeable to these bills?

Mr. MALONE. There are two classifications of persons involved. One consists of men who are now producers; the other consists of those who would like to become producers.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand from the information which I have received in the past few minutes, the producers themselves are satisfied with the proposed legislation. They think it might have been much worse, and they are quite willing to accept it. We are vitally interested in the success and well-being of the industry. I would be one of the first to object to these measures if there were objection on the part of our producers. I was just wondering if the Senator from Nevada had considered the fact that the industry itself is not objecting.

Mr. MALONE. I have arrived at my position after carefully considering all the factors. For a period of 5 years I have debated this subject on the Senate floor.

It is well established that I am interested in the American producers. A small miner in my State, one who possibly does not have money enough to send us a telegram, goes into the hills and finds enough ore to permit him to keep eating, but here on the Senate floor we tamper with the tariff until that miner cannot make a living.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the tariff is of little consequence and that the producers are amply protected in the price?

Mr. MALONE. I think this New Deal administration has meddled with the price so long that no one knows what is going on. The administration will fix a price by which the industry can live, and then tomorrow it will change it. The administration boys have full leeway. And we have evidence that Congress will not stop them.

We hope that condition will end sometime, for, if it does not, the administration will cook up something which will completely wipe out private investments.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that suspension of duties on both lead and zinc will merely provide additional profits for producers of these minerals abroad, but will in no way help to stimulate domestic production and will continue the disadvantages under which our own mining industry is laboring at the present time?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Idaho is exactly correct. He has put his finger on the sore spot. It would simply mean that the foreign price, which recently has been considerably higher than the domestic price, will continue, giving foreign producers the advantage. The Government has removed the last vestige of protection that an American investor might reasonably expect, and calamity would come if the President suddenly ran out of emergencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Instead of trying to increase the profits of mineral producers abroad, would it not be more advantageous if some objectives were initiated to stimulate production on the part of small-mine operators throughout the United States so they will be able to cope with the high costs of production and do something to increase the availability of lead and zinc in this country?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if this Congress had the gumption to lay down the principle of fair and reasonable competition as a basis for a tariff or an import fee, not merely on minerals, but on textiles and every other product, the situation would be greatly improved. Why vote for tax bills which would be unnecessary if we followed the American principle? We have been going down the wrong road the past 18 years. The set-up of our entire economy has been so arranged that our taxpayers have to finance the war plants, the exploration abroad, and the development, with no hope of a return on the investment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing for the Senators from the West to speak for their industry. If they object to these bills, they take the responsibility.

Mr. MALONE. I will take the responsibility.

Mr. GEORGE. There has been a ceiling price put upon the two products, and I think the Senator will see that it is to the advantage of the industry to accept these bills as they came from the House. But if there is objection—

Mr. MALONE. We have plenty of time. I intend to make a short speech immediately following this discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not mind the Senator making a speech, but we are operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator wants to call that rule, I will start from here. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES W. VANDERHOOP

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar 779 (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop in the amount of \$639.39. I have spoken to the majority leader, to the minority calendar committee, and to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who objected to the consideration of the bill. It involves a man who retired from the Coast Guard in December 1937. He had no knowledge of his claim until the Comptroller General made a ruling on October 28, 1937, so he had less than 2 months within which to bring his claim within the statute of limitations. He was on a far away island. There is a precedent for this bill, and I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, originally I had asked the calendar committee of the minority to enter objection to this bill. My reason for objecting to it was that it seemed to be a bill to waive the statute of limitations, and ordinarily I am opposed to waiving the statute of limitations unless there is good sound reason for it and the case does not set a precedent. We should either enforce the statute of limitations, or we should repeal it. The number of bills which are coming before the Judiciary Committee asking for the waiving of the statute of limitations has alarmed many members of that committee.

I have heard the explanation of House bill 2546 by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, and I am convinced that it is probably one of the exceptions which will not set a general precedent, to which I am opposed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Therefore, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT MATTERS IN THE APPENDIX AFTER THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be given leave to have matters printed in subsequent issues of the Record following the adjournment of the Congress. I understand that is the customary order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, does that mean that it can be done without Senators asking special consideration, that Senators may place in the Record such matters as they desire?

Mr. McFARLAND. Until the last issue of the Record is made up, I am

asking that Senators may insert matters.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it a general permission, or do Senators have to ask permission specially.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am asking for general permission in behalf of all Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to get a little matter straightened out, then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to get the matter just discussed straightened out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has just asked unanimous consent that certain materials may be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Is there any limitation upon the type of material which may be placed in the RECORD, or the length of the material?

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the customary end-of-a-session request. Of course, if the matter did not comply with the rules as to the length, it could not be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, if permission is asked for the insertion of more than the customary two pages, there must be an estimate of the cost filed with the material?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that if the material is a speech by a Senator himself, or a letter from a Senator in his own language, the rule relating to two pages does not apply? I should like to have that matter cleared up.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the rule does not apply to a Senator's speech; but when he attempts to put into the Appendix material not his own, or material falling in one of the excepted classes, it does apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that under the rule regarding printing there is no restriction as to the length of statements Senators may have printed in the RECORD or the Appendix of the RECORD if they are their own statements.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, Mr. President, that applies to the remarks of Senators and Representatives, the President or Vice President, or members of the Cabinet. It would not apply to other matters sought to be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The words of a Senator issued in a statement, speech, or otherwise, do not fall under the rule.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was my understanding of the ruling heretofore made.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Arizona and the Chair.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now wish to comment on the parliamentary procedure immediately ahead. We have concluded the call of the calendar.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I have been seeking to get into communication with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to file a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate passed House bill 320, and before the Senator from Arizona leaves the subject of the calendar entirely, I should like to have an opportunity to find whether the Senator would object to that motion being called up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall not object to that later, if unanimous consent is sought. However, I now want to get something before the Senate. Was the Senator from Oklahoma intending to ask unanimous consent, or to call the motion up for consideration?

Mr. KERR. I was intending to call it up for consideration if the Senator from Illinois were available to participate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand he is not in the city.

Mr. KERR. I understand that, but I am going to talk with his assistant, who has been handling the matter for the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I was unable to hear the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. What is the calendar number of the bill to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred?

Mr. KERR. The Senator may find it in the present calendar under "Motions for reconsideration."

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is H. R. 320.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Do I understand correctly that the parliamentary situation with reference to the calendar call just concluded is that there will be no calling up of any other bills heretofore passed over on the call of the calendar unless by motion or by unanimous consent?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is the way it would have to be done.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I desired to be sure we had finally concluded the call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, we have concluded the call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand we have concluded the regular call of the calendar, but Senators are not precluded from calling up any bill on the calendar which has been previously called. They can ask unanimous consent to take a bill up. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators are precluded in the present situation, because there is a motion pending. I desire to get a bill before the Senate. Of course, a motion can be set aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the able majority leader be willing to have taken up today Calendar No. 543, Senate bill 913, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States? It is a bill in which some of us are very much interested, a bill which I think is of considerable merit, a measure which has been given most careful study by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and which was reported unanimously by the committee. I believe all the members of the committee save one became cosponsors of the bill.

I may say to the able majority leader that this is a bill which, if it will accomplish what is hoped, is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation to come before this body. It is a matter which I should like to have disposed of at this session, in order that the House may take it up early in the next session. If the bill were passed, we would be able to make some progress toward setting up the machinery to service appropriation committees, and keep a watch over the budget.

Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield further—

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the Washington Evening Star of yesterday afternoon there appeared a news article regarding a speech by a distinguished Cabinet member, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. I call attention to this because it is right in line with the bill which I am anxious to have considered. I shall not read all of the article, but I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAWYER HITS WASTE, AID TO INCOMPETENT IN UNITED STATES BUDGET SET-UP—COMMERCE SECRETARY ASKS DRASTIC REVISIONS AND FEWER SERVICES

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 19.—Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said today the Government's budget practices encourage spending instead of saving, and keep incompetents on the public pay roll.

Drastic decisions must be made to revise the budget system and cut out less essential services, the Secretary added.

Otherwise, he suggested, the Government's currency and credit would be debauched and "the backbone of our capitalistic system" could be destroyed.

The Cabinet member's blast, in a speech prepared for an Ohio State University advertising conference, came as a surprise in view of President Truman's recent vigorous defense of the Federal budget. The President had sharply criticized those who attack the budget.

Secretary Sawyer ridiculed what he called the Government's mania for new agencies, commissions, and study groups. He singled out two new offices for criticism.

Creation by Congress of a Small Defense Plants Administration, Mr. Sawyer said, will result in "the new agency being added to old ones." He added: "The work could have been done by existing agencies effectively and with a great saving of the taxpayers' money."

The second example of what he called needless creation of Federal offices was the establishment of a new administration to supervise all foreign aid, also done by Congress. Secretary Sawyer said establishing a separate agency as a "Sarta Claus department . . . in the long run would produce an unbearable drain upon the taxpayers."

Secretary Sawyer said various proposals for streamlining the Government by reorganization can save a little of the taxpayers' money, but not much.

"To accomplish great savings we will be forced to cut down or get rid of certain functions now being performed," Secretary Sawyer said. Any specific proposals along this line, he added, will be greeted by a howl of protest and anger from every affected individual or group throughout the country.

Mr. Sawyer suggested:

1. Federal departments should be allowed to keep any money left over at the end of a budget year instead of turning the surplus back to the Treasury as is now required. The current practice has resulted, Mr. Sawyer said, in "frantic efforts—and I use the word frantic advisedly"—to spend any surplus moneys.

2. Bosses of Federal agencies should be given more power over hiring, firing, and promoting employees than they have now under the civil-service system.

3. Instead of appropriating funds piecemeal to bureaus and agencies within a department, Congress should make one appropriation to the head of the department to permit the executive to do a better management job and hold costs to a minimum.

4. If Congress decrees a percentage cut in a department budget, it should let the department head distribute the cut as he sees fit instead of forcing a curtailment in all activities without regard to their need.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The article reads:

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said today the Government's budget practices encourage spending instead of saving, and keep incompetents on the public payroll.

Drastic decisions must be made to revise the budget system and cut out less essential services, Secretary Sawyer added.

I shall not read further.

The purpose of the bill is to create a joint committee of Congress patterned after the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The joint committee would supervise the budget, in the sense of examining it, going into the departments and agencies with an adequate, trained staff to find out where the waste is, and where savings can be made, and to inform the Congress and the Appropriations Committees, when appropriation bills come before us, as to where cuts can be made judiciously, instead of resorting to a meat-ax operation, as we now have to do, without any intelligent information as to where the cuts can be made.

This is important legislation. There is a need for it. If this is not the right approach, there is need for some kind of approach to the problem. I was hoping that the bill might be brought up

and passed by the Senate and sent to the House, in order that action might be obtained over there early in the next session.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has done a great deal of work in connection with this particular legislation. It is important legislation. I know that he has given much thought to it. In my judgment he is entitled to have the Senate consider his bill and I have told him so several times.

However, we all know that the bill is controversial. I know that my own colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] is interested in it. I shall not undertake to state his position. I am sure other Members, some of whom are not present today, desire to express their views with respect to it. If we are to adjourn today, I feel that it is my duty not to take up major controversial matters unless by unanimous consent, and unless notice has previously been given that a particular bill would be taken up. Notice has not been given that this bill would be taken up.

As my good friend from Arkansas himself said, the House would not consider the bill in this session. I will say to him that I will take the legislation up with the Policy Committee, and I will use my influence to see that his bill receives early consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement by the able Senator from Arkansas referring to the speech by the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, I wonder if the Senator would yield to me for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the Secretary's speech.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to do so. In fact, I tried to get in touch with the Secretary this morning to obtain a copy so that I could insert the full text of his speech in the RECORD. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the address delivered by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer at the Ohio State University advertising conference, at Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a brief comment on this subject?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator from Arkansas has called the attention of the Senate to the bill which he and many other Senators have sponsored. I know that his committee has given a great deal of attention to the subject. However, it is a matter of such great importance to the fiscal policy of the Government that in my judgment there ought to be a full-dress debate on the floor.

The Senator from Arkansas is walking along the road that we should follow. The greatest danger that confronts our country now arises from inflation—inflation here at home and inflation abroad, which will be occasioned by the expenditure of huge sums, particularly for military purposes, and also for other purposes. It is utterly impossible under the present system to make the proper review of the expenditures of this Government. We must find a way in the next session of Congress to cut down expenditures in whatever field they happen to be. My own judgment is that the greatest saving can be made in the military field. Eighty-four percent of all the expenditures of the Government during this fiscal year are war-connected in one way or another.

We are now on the road to authorizing additional expenditures which may invite another deficit. The bill to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred is one which in my judgment is in the public interest, and ought to be considered. I am glad that the majority leader has given his assurance to the Senator from Arkansas that this bill will be given a place at the beginning of the next session.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is an important and influential member of the majority policy committee and his judgment will be extremely persuasive with his colleagues.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader for the assurance that this subject will be given some priority of attention early in the next session.

I realize that this bill ought to be considered. The committee has worked hard on it. We have done our best. We believe that we have reported a good bill. From the time I introduce the bill I have endeavored to obtain the best help and counsel I could get in trying to draft a bill which would actually accomplish some of the most desirable and necessary economies.

Let me say further to the majority leader that in view of the fact that Congress is scheduled to adjourn today I shall not press for consideration of the bill at this time, because there are Senators who probably wish to discuss it. There may be some features or provisions of the bill which should be thoroughly discussed.

However, I wish again to emphasize that when the Congress reconvenes I shall do everything in my power to obtain consideration for the bill in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for just a word?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say just one sentence to the Senator from Arkansas. I think he knows the subject.

There is another reason for waiting until the first of the year. The minority

leader [Mr. WHERRY] has a bill of his own on the calendar on this subject. He is much interested. Under all the circumstances I am glad that he will have an opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to do is to make certain that the bill will receive consideration early in the next session.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope Senators will now let me straighten out the calendar situation for the opening days of the second session. I want the Senate to know what we propose to do when we reconvene. Of course, we are not going to adjourn at this moment, since the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] desires to make some remarks, and there are several conference reports yet to be considered. However, I wish to have something before the Senate, and I want the Senate to know what we are going to take up when we return.

Pursuant to the colloquy with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday dealing with his motion to proceed to consider Senate bill 2104, I now withdraw the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2104 in behalf of the junior Senator from Arkansas, and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1976. That is the so-called home rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Of course, we are not going to complete consideration of the home rule bill today. I know that my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has a few remarks to make, either for or against the bill. However, I want him to have sufficient notice as to when the bill is coming up. He will thus have a little more than 2 months to prepare his remarks. I am told that the longer one takes to prepare a speech the shorter the speech. So I thought it advisable to make the home rule bill the unfinished business for next session, because I am afraid that with so little time for preparation now the Senator from South Carolina would not be able to let us adjourn today.

I am sure, however, that if we give him plenty of notice, he will be able to proceed rapidly next January.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection to having the majority leader say that his motion is pending to take up the home rule bill. So far as I am concerned, I intend to begin speaking immediately if he insists on going any further than saying that his motion is pending to take up the home rule bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted the Senate to know what was coming up initially in the next session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Arizona has made his motion to take up the home-rule bill, and the motion is before the Senate. I do not object to that, but I am not going to give up what I have to say with regard to the motion to take up. We can discuss the motion at the same time that we discuss the bill itself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that obviously there is going to be considerable discussion in the early part of the next session with regard to the home-rule bill, I was wondering whether the able Senator from Arizona, our majority leader, would not give consideration to taking up the bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

The two great Territories have been waiting at the door, so to speak, for admission to statehood for a long period of time. I believe it is obvious to any of us who are interested in the subject—and I see on the floor the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who I know has a deep interest in the question—that unless the bills are taken up early in the session, when they can be adequately discussed, it will mean that another session of Congress will pass without these two great Territories having had a chance to be admitted into the Union.

I sincerely plead with the majority leader that he give consideration to giving the statehood bills the right of way early in the session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have stated on several occasions that the statehood bills were on the agenda for early consideration. The Senator from California I believe, knows it is our firm intention to take those bills up at the earliest opportunity after we reconvene. With all due respect to my good friend from South Carolina, the home-rule bill was passed in 1 day during the last session. I do not believe it will take very long to dispose of it next January. I do not believe there is very much opposition to it, although I may be wrong.

Let me make clear again that I have also given notice that immediately following disposition of the home rule bill we will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2104, Calendar Number 745, the so-called fats and oils repeal bill in which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are interested. After that bill is disposed of, we will determine the next order of business but the so-called statehood bills will receive prior consideration at that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad that the Senator from California has referred to the statehood bills. I believe the RECORD is clear that the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate, at one of its meetings during this session, decided that the statehood bills would have priority of consideration at the beginning of the new session.

The Governor of Hawaii has been in the city during the past week or 10 days. I have had numerous conferences with him. I know from him and others that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are waiting anxiously upon the action of this Congress with respect to the statehood legislation.

I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that it will be my purpose, as chairman of the Committee on Interior

and Insular Affairs, to take the earliest practicable step in the new session to bring up for consideration the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. The people of those two Territories are entitled to have a decision made by Congress, and nothing will be left undone at the beginning of the next session to bring that about.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been very diligent in moving the statehood bills forward not only in his own committee but before the policy committee. The bills were not taken up for floor action, as he well knows, because we were working almost entirely on important national defense matters and appropriation bills. Of course, they will be given early priority in the next session.

The District of Columbia home rule bill is in the same category but should not take as long to consider. I feel it should be disposed of promptly and I have agreed that we would make the fats and oil bill the second order of business. That bill, also will not take very long to consider, in my judgment. Thereafter we will decide on the order of succeeding bills but the statehood bills and the measure referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are both on the calendar and will receive our early attention.

MANPOWER POLICY OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Utah, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have been receiving strong protests from fathers of members of the Utah National Guard whose sons have been trained in the National Guard as artillerymen, but apparently have been recently assigned to front-line duty in Korea as infantrymen.

Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah has also wired me that reports reaching Utah indicate that men trained for specific assignments in Utah National Guard units are being transferred out of these units to other duties not consistent with their training.

The Governor states:

We have several examples wherein National Guard artillerymen have been transferred into infantry units for front-line duty in Korea. I am preparing letter protesting this action of the Army since it violates definite pledges made to National Guard enlistees nullifying the training they have received and places them in new duties without adequate preparation.

One of the members of the Utah National Guard who was trained as an artilleryman was killed in action a short time ago in Korea. According to the dispatches, he was serving with an Infantry regiment, having been transferred from the Utah National Guard to this position. My information is that

he was not given any training as an infantryman, at least not adequate training, before being sent up to the front to engage in combat.

The people of Utah are becoming very alarmed and indignant over recent policies of the Defense Department with respect to these assignments and the rotation plan which has been put in effect in the Far East Command.

I have sent a letter of inquiry and protest to General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army. I hope I shall receive a prompt explanation of what appears to be a very dangerous policy if it is being carried out extensively.

Mr. President, the fathers of many of the Utah National Guard men are veterans of World War I and World War II. They know what it means to fight without adequate training or to be trained for one branch of the service and suddenly to be shifted to another branch and then be ordered into battle.

The people of my State have shown their patriotism through two World Wars and their National Guard units are now bearing some of the heaviest fighting in Korea and have been doing so for at least 6 months. They have won distinction as fighters in several severe battles. The people of Utah are rightly very proud of them. There is no lack of patriotism among the Utah people, and, in protesting against what they believe is a wrong policy, they feel they are performing a patriotic duty, even though some of the matters called to public attention may be embarrassing to those in charge of the armed services.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to pass judgment on the Defense Department; I am not attempting in any way to take over its functions, but as one representative of the men who have to do the fighting and the dying, I feel that this matter deserves the utmost consideration by those who are in charge of our fighting forces.

A question has come to my mind many times with respect to some of the policies of our commanding officers. In the present circumstances, if it should be true that artillerymen without training other than that given to the artillery are being sent into the front lines fighting with infantry regiments, then that action must have been taken either as one of necessity or as the result of blunders on the part of someone in command at lower levels.

In thinking over this situation, Mr. President, I am led to contrast the circumstances which I have called to the attention of the Senate and the situation which exists in Formosa. Only yesterday, Admiral Charles Maynard Cooke, retired, testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am a member.

Admiral Cooke has just returned from 2 years in Formosa as head of a mission which has been furnishing technical and military advice to the Nationalist Chinese. During the war, Admiral Cooke was Chief Strategic and Policy Adviser to Admiral King, Commander in Chief of the United States Navy. From 1946 to 1948, Admiral Cooke was in command of all United States forces in China.

Admiral Cooke told our committee that there are many hundreds of thousands of able-bodied Chinese soldiers who for various reasons, many of them intensely personal, are bitterly anti-Communist. Quite a number of these men are well-trained and, with the proper equipment, could give a good account of themselves in Korea, relieving some of our troops who have been there a long time and, because of necessity, have not yet been rotated.

These Chinese soldiers fought on the mainland, and were forced to retreat to Formosa. Since that time they have learned of the torture and death of many of their relatives. They are consumed with a desire to defend the liberties of their country and to beat back the aggressor.

It is incomprehensible to me, as it is to many of the people of my State, that the United Nations, or the United States, which seems to be running the war on the anti-Communist side in Korea, should hesitate for one moment to allow these Chinese soldiers, who form the hard core of anti-communism in Asia to take their place in battle, and thus relieve many thousands of our own men who have been up to the front, without relief, for such long periods of time.

If only a portion of this anti-communist Chinese Army were permitted to fight their bitter enemies, there would be no need to send artillerymen to take the place of infantrymen in the front lines in Korea.

Mr. President, this matter is not a new one. It has been debated time and again in the Halls of Congress and throughout the Nation. Yet for some reason the administration and those in charge of the United Nations forces in Korea refuse to permit the Chinese patriots to fight to defend their own freedom and to avenge the slaughter of their loved ones.

Nationalist China is a member of the United Nations. The war in Korea is said to be a United Nations' action to stop and punish an aggressor who has breached the peace of the world. Requests have gone out to all United Nations members to contribute forces and to aid in the Korean conflict.

Nationalist China has offered thousands of trained fighting men for service in Korea. These offers have been refused.

At one time it was said that the Chinese forces in Formosa could not be used because their use might provoke Red China or Russia to intervene in the war in behalf of North Korea. But it has been nearly a year since the Red Chinese did intervene and became the aggressor. So that excuse is no longer valid. The American people ought to rise in their wrath and demand that all those willing to fight communism in Asia, particularly those who have special rights to carry on that fight, should be used in every battle and at every point where they can be used effectively.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah permit me to interrupt him at this time; and will the Senator from Nevada yield to me at this

time, without disturbing in any way his right to the floor?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is given that there may be a colloquy at this time between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from California, I shall be very happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether he is familiar with the fact that the offer of the Republic of China of 33,000 of their best troops, 4 days after the aggression took place in Korea—which is the offer the able Senator from Utah has just mentioned—constitutes the offering of as many troops as all those which the other members of the United Nations, excluding the United States, have placed in Korea until this very day, some 16 months after the war began in that area of the world.

Mr. WATKINS. I have heard that stated as a fact, and I think it is a fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Utah realize that the other members of the United Nations, aside from the United States of America, have put into Korea only 10 percent of the forces which have been sent to Korea by the United States alone?

Mr. WATKINS. That is a generally accepted fact, and it is one which in my opinion reflects upon the other members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Admiral Cooke also told our committee that the equipment so vitally needed by these Chinese Nationalist forces was coming in slowly and in small amounts. In other words, there seems to be priority elsewhere for arms and munitions which could be used to good advantage in Asia, where it is most needed, and where a bitter war is now being waged against us.

Mr. President, Admiral Cooke's testimony should be brought home to every American throughout the land. His entire statement was a damning indictment of our far eastern policy which resulted in the loss of China to the free world, and which has made necessary more than 90,000 casualties to our own forces in the last 16 months.

Mr. President, Admiral Cooke appeared and testified before the committee. I have had assembled some excerpts from his testimony, and I now ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF ADMIRAL CHARLES MAYNARD COOKE, WHO APPEARED BEFORE THE SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 19, 1951

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Admiral Cooke, are any Chinese troops sent into Korea at all?

Mr. COOKE. No; no troops going to Korea. Senator WATKINS. You mean Nationalist, do you not?

Mr. COOKE. Nationalist troops, yes. Nationalist troops, you mean?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. COOKE. No, none have gone.

Mr. MORRIS. Have the Chinese volunteered to send any to Formosa?

Mr. COOKE. Yes. Of course, that is a matter of public knowledge, and they offered to send them there a few days after the war broke out.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Well, I am asking you, Admiral Cooke, if you have any special knowledge since then.

Mr. COOKE. Except this: That they had it under immediate consideration as soon as the news of the invasion of Korea took place. The actual offer was made that week, I think a few days later, and after the Seventh Fleet was put in the picture.

Mr. MORRIS. Admiral Cooke, do you think that Chinese forces should be sent to Korea?

Mr. COOKE. Very much so, for a number of reasons. Would you like for me to—

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I would like you to recite them, Admiral.

Mr. COOKE. Well, the first is that I consider that China is a proper member and a faithful member of the United Nations, and should support the opposition to aggression in Korea, which was a continuance of the Russian aggression in China itself.

Secondly, I felt that it would very much improve the efficiency of the Chinese troops.

In other words, I feel, and I suppose most of us do, that the efficiency of our own divisions may be doubled or certainly very much increased by the war experience. Of the Chinese Army, there were the three divisions which were offered to be sent up there, and had they been up there during this time, or had any experience up there, it would improve very materially their capability of defending Formosa itself.

In other words, we are now spending money to improve the defense of Formosa. We would probably double the effectiveness of their defending army if we had had some troops, say of the strength of an army, about 30,000 men—in Korea during this period.

There was another thing that bore on the subject:

When the question was being considered of offering troops to go there, there was doubt expressed among Chinese and, I suppose, among the people here—I was in Formosa at the time—that it might bring the Chinese Communists into the Korean war. It was my view, to those Chinese I talked to, and I stated it, that I didn't think it would have any effect on it whatsoever.

If the Chinese Communists were going in—they were moving troops up there anywhere at that time—it would take place regardless of what the Nationalist troops did.

Well, the offer was made, and, of course, it was not accepted. One other aspect that developed after the Chinese Communists did come into the war, in late November, was that this would be the means to encourage disaffections from the Chinese Communists back to the Nationalist side, because some of them had previously been Nationalist troops, among other things.

Mr. MORRIS. It would be a greater inducement to surrender to a Chinese troop than an American.

Mr. COOKE. That is a matter of speculation, but it is a view that was shared by most people.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, have you any questions?

Senator WATKINS. I am wondering if there is any reason why he cannot tell us what the present situation is in Formosa with respect to these Nationalist troops.

Mr. COOKE. Well, that question was asked, in part, this morning.

Senator WATKINS. It is regretted that I could not stay all morning.

Mr. COOKE. Well, in part, I felt that I probably shouldn't answer that. The United States is sending equipment out there to reinforce the strength, and just what equipment they are sending and how strong it is,

I thought, maybe, was a confidential matter of security, and I should not touch upon it. Senator WATKINS. I would not insist upon it.

Mr. COOKE. But I would go on to say this: That the troops have very fine spirit. There is no question about that in my mind, they are good fighters. Their equipment, of course, has got to be reinforced. The British, for instance, left the mainland at Dunkirk and didn't take much equipment with them. The Chinese, coming over to Formosa, they did take more with them, but still they didn't have enough anyhow, and they didn't get it all over there, and so they are deficient. Their organization and training can be improved. It is improving, but it needs more improvement. Our people are engaged in doing that, as some of my group were beforehand.

Senator WATKINS. Is it not, as a matter of fact, the largest group of anti-Communist forces in Asia?

Mr. COOKE. I think so.

Senator WATKINS. That is from outside of the United Nations?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, definitely.

Senator WATKINS. The regular troops.

Mr. COOKE. Yes, a very large group. The fighting spirit of the men is very good. The caliber of the leadership, in which they have been deficient in the past, is improving, and so they have a very fine force, a very fine body of men, I think, which, with certain amount of war experiences, such as in Korea, or maybe reactivation on the mainland, would come up to a very high style. It will not be the same as an American division, no, but they will be as good as the Communist divisions.

DEFENSE EFFORTS OF WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me briefly, with the understanding that in doing so he will not lose the floor? I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article appearing in the New York Times on October 18, 1951, in the form of a special dispatch from The Hague, the Netherlands. According to the article, apparently the Government of the Netherlands resented certain testimony which was given before the House Appropriations Committee, relative to the contributions being made by the Netherlands Government in the matter of the mutual defense system which has been established.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the two Houses of Congress, through their Appropriations Committees, are entitled to the facts in regard to what is being done to help themselves by the nations we are aiding. I wish to serve notice that when the next arms implementation bill comes before the Congress, we shall expect to obtain more information than we got this year, not less.

At this time I also wish to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from pages 208 and 209 of the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee at the time when these questions relative to the Netherlands were raised.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 18, 1951]

THE HAGUE RESENTS DEFENSE CRITICISM—DUTCH FOLLOW DANES IN PROTEST OVER PUBLICIZED TESTIMONY BY UNITED STATES ARMY DIRECTOR

THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS, October 17.—The Netherlands, following Denmark's lead, is advising Washington of her objection to a statement of Brig. Gen. George S. Olmsted, director of the United States Defense Department's military assistance program, that termed the defense efforts of several Western European countries, including the Netherlands, inadequate.

General Olmsted's testimony before an appropriations subcommittee of the House of Representatives was considered by the Dutch Cabinet. Irrespective of the merits of his appraisal, the Dutch feel that it was highly improper for an official United States spokesman to express himself on a matter that at this moment is the subject of a far-reaching inquiry by a North Atlantic Pact committee in Paris.

The Netherlands Government has just received two exhaustive questionnaires from the Paris group: one asks information about economic resources and potentialities; the other seeks data about the military situation. It is thought here that the search for a formula on the apportionment of a defense contribution is prejudiced by such statements as that of General Olmsted's.

The Netherlands' sense of propriety has been offended, and it helps little to explain to them at General Olmsted's statement is the sort of thing that just happens in Washington and was not intended to have any connection with the study authorized by the North Atlantic Treaty Council.

FIGURES ESTIMATED UNILATERALLY

In addition, the Netherlands Government has a specific reason for feeling outraged. General Olmsted listed Dutch defense expenditures in the current fiscal year as \$520,000,000. This does not represent Dutch expenditures but a unilateral United States estimate of what they should be. Dutch officials were irritated when they learned a few months ago that this figure was being used confidentially in international discussions. Now that it has been employed publicly, they feel indignant.

Actually, the Dutch defense budget for the current year is about \$294,000,000. By adding extra budgetary expenditures, mainly in counterpart funds, the total defense spending probably will not exceed \$430,000,000.

The first project for the use of counterpart funds for defense production was announced today by the Economic Cooperation Administration. It has approved a Dutch proposal to spend 175,000,000 guilders (about \$45,600,000) to purchase three-quarter-ton weapon carriers and two-and-a-half-ton prime movers of new Dutch design.

A further release of 55,000,000 guilders is being considered for the manufacture of communications equipment and munitions.

DUTCH ASK UNITED STATES FOR TRANSCRIPT

WASHINGTON, October 17.—The State Department has received from the United States Embassy in The Hague a request for recent testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee relating to the Mutual Defense Assistance program.

The request was made on behalf of the Netherlands Government. Presumably The Hague is interested in sections dealing with the Dutch rearmament effort, and a copy of the testimony will be sent.

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1952, PART I, PAGES 208 AND 209

Mr. BISSELL. That is correct, sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I put in the regular figures. These are the same figures I have given in the case of other countries.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

First, what is the military job that we hope and expect that the Netherlands will undertake?

In fiscal 1951 military expenditures were \$280,000,000. On the basis of our present planning and of the present appropriation request we believe that they will be able to increase that to \$400,000,000 during the current fiscal year.

On the basis of the higher figure for aid, the authorization request, we had hoped that they could raise their total military expenditures as high as \$525,000,000.

I would like to give you figures which will give those totals as a percentage of the gross national product. That was some 5 percent of the gross national product in the fiscal year just ended. The higher figure of \$525,000,000 which we believe would be attainable with somewhat more economic aid would be 9.1 percent of the gross national product.

I suppose that the figure of \$400,000,000 is in the neighborhood of 7 percent of the gross national product.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In other words, the gross national product is \$5,600,000,000.

Mr. BISSELL. The exact figure is \$5,538,000,000. In other words, in round numbers, \$5,600,000,000, Mr. Wigglesworth; that is correct.

This is the next set of figures I mentioned. That was during fiscal 1951. We hope that from \$5,538,000,000 it can be increased to \$5,688,000,000; in other words, by about \$150,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

We believe in the case of the Netherlands that there will be a very slight decline in total consumption, from \$3,468,000,000 to \$3,429,000,000, in terms of constant dollars.

We believe there can be a percentage-wise slightly greater decline in total capital investment, from \$1,578,000,000 to \$1,521,000,000.

In other words, the increase in military expenditures in the case of the Netherlands will absorb the whole increase in the gross national product; and, in addition, will have to be accomplished in part through cut-backs of both consumption and of capital investment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, and passed by the Senate on reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do pass, two-thirds of the Representatives present having voted in the affirmative.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolu-

tion, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 210. An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates;

S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Karstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka;

H. R. 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton;

H. R. 853. An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter;

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots;

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H. R. 1628. An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H. R. 2176. An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazel Thrall;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of Mazunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H. R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito;

H. R. 2632. An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalbisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scelato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso;

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane;

H. R. 3003. An act to authorize Rear Admiral Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of Fanny Tshrintge Papani;

H. R. 3548. An act to provide that payment to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H. R. 3669. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Insurance Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart;

H. R. 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles;

H. R. 4203. An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 4567. An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H. R. 4692. An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

H. R. 4808. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.;

H. R. 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H. R. 4928. An act to provide that the interests of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky.;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervea);

H. R. 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H. Craft;

H. R. 4940. An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard;

H. R. 4945. An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail;

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason;

H. R. 5062. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status;

H. R. 5104. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis;

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.;

H. R. 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 5730. An act for the relief of William Lund Main; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota not to exceed 2 minutes, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall not speak at this time, then; I cannot finish in 2 minutes what I wish to say.

Mr. MALONE. How long does the distinguished Senator from North Dakota think he will require?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make a motion; that is all. It may take me 5, 10, or 15 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. Then I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I would rather not confine my remarks to 5 minutes. I shall speak later, in my own time.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILWAY AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS, RESOLUTION OF MOUNTAIN PACIFIC STATES CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONS, AND ADDRESS ENTITLED "VALUATION: THE STATE COMMISSIONS, AND SECTION 19A," BY CLYDE B. AITCHISON

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to permit me

to make a brief statement and an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for that purpose, if it is understood that I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted at Charleston, S. C., on October 18, 1951, by the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners; and also a resolution adopted on October 17, 1951, at Charleston, S. C., by the Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions. I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by Hon. Clyde B. Aitchison, for 20 years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, perhaps the leading authority in the United States in the field of transportation, which address was delivered before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, at Charleston, S. C., on October 16, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. And, Mr. President, if the Senator would yield for a unanimous-consent request concerning a report—

Mr. MALONE. There will be plenty of time for all reports.

Mr. KERR. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. KERR. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object to the insertions in the RECORD—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes, there is, for insertions in the RECORD, and I am reserving the right to object to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to offer for insertion in the RECORD what purport to be certain resolutions adopted by some corporate body, and I should like to have, before we adjourn the Senate today, a clarification of the rules of the Senate in regard to insertions of resolutions in the RECORD. Let me first assure my friend from Oklahoma that I think they ought to be inserted in the RECORD, and I think they ought to be inserted in the RECORD by unanimous consent. But let me refresh the memory of the Presiding Officer. Some weeks ago the junior Senator from Oregon offered certain resolutions on the floor of the Senate, by way of a unanimous-consent request, and he was advised of a ruling by the Chair the day preceding, to the effect that the resolutions could not be introduced by unanimous consent, but would have to be submitted to a committee—I believe the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration—and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration would then pass judgment on whether the resolutions could subsequently go into the RECORD. The junior Senator from Oregon served notice that never would any resolution offered by him have to go through that procedure, because he would read them first; and he did read them on that

occasion, at some length. But I said then that I thought the ruling of the Chair should be clarified. It never has been clarified, and I have just been waiting for this opportunity, Mr. President, to get the matter clarified before Congress adjourns.

Reserving the right to object, the parliamentary inquiry I put to the Presiding Officer is whether the resolutions offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which apparently are resolutions which were adopted by an appropriate body in convention assembled, have to be submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration before they can be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, if so, I should like to have the Presiding Officer tell us why there is any such ruling, and upon what rule of the Senate the ruling is based.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOORE in the chair). It is the opinion of this Presiding Officer that by unanimous consent the resolutions and address which have been offered by the Senator from Oklahoma can go into the RECORD, if there is no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Presiding Officer that I completely agree with that ruling. I am very happy to have it, and by that ruling we, I think, erase what up to this minute has been a very unfortunate precedent established in this session of the Congress. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

SO-CALLED FREE TRADE A BONUS TO FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to continue the debate which was terminated under the 5-minute rule.

The chairman of the Finance Committee offered two bills, removing the tariff and import fees from commodities. This is simply a continuation of administration policy adopted 18 years ago.

The administration is thoroughly saturated with a one-economic-world philosophy, merging gradually into a one-political-world philosophy. The administration has divided the markets of this country with other nations of the world, giving the users of the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia full access to our machinery and bringing in the foreign manufactured products without restraint, in direct competition with the workers and investors of this country.

WRECKING ECONOMY OF AMERICA

We are sending from five to nine billion dollars into foreign countries without laying down any conditions whatever, completing the wrecking of the economy of this country. We have printed money freely, with no consideration to any gold base for the money, to carry out this philosophy. The administration has not been checked on the amount of money it prints.

If taxes are raised much higher, no one will be able to pay them. Already in some cases the taxes amount to a capital levy. The Truman administra-

tion has followed the fallacious theory that taxes must be raised to siphon off increases in wages and to take any money which an investor may have earned from his investments. This is wrecking our economic system. We are living off of borrowed money. We are selling new bonds, borrowing more money, as rapidly as we can and printing money against the bonds. As soon as the administration runs out of emergencies, then the economy will crumble.

BIG APPROPRIATIONS AND HIGH TAXES COULD BE AVOIDED

Mr. President, there would be no need for such a gargantuan appropriation if we could be sure of a floor under wages and investments, and should restore the metal base, the gold, to our currency, stopping this senseless printing of money, and stopping this throwing of money around everywhere in the world without any conditions attached.

Mr. President, instead of a continuation of gift-loans to foreign nations, we could accept the currencies of other nations for our goods. They say they are short of dollars—that great hoax sold to the American people. Mr. President, the shortage comes about because they put a price in dollars on their money which no one will pay. For example, the British pound is fixed at \$2.80, but \$2.20 is all that anyone is willing to pay.

The budget could be balanced and taxes could be reduced by the simple expedient of three things: first, put gold behind our own money and stop the irresponsible printing of currency; second, establish a basis of fair and reasonable competition for the goods of foreign nations in the markets of this country through the flexible import-fee principle; and third, accept the currencies of other nations for the purchases of goods in this country, putting the foreign money into a special fund in the Treasury to purchase the goods of those foreign nations.

DO NOT SHUT DOOR OF OPPORTUNITY ON AMERICANS

Mr. President, I am interested in the producers of the United States. I refer to the producers of lead and zinc, textiles, petroleum, crockery—every type of manufactured product in this country. I am also interested in people who want to become producers, the little people who are prospectors for metals and minerals and people who would like to go into other businesses. Let us not shut the door of opportunity on those people too small to establish foreign branch plants and take advantage of foreign low-wage standards.

A market for American business was supposed to have been developed in foreign countries through the great Marshall plan, the ECA, Point 4, UNRRA, and other trick organizations for which the people of this country fell. Because of cheap sweatshop labor, those nations send goods back into this country in competition with the investors and workers of this country, forcing American workers out of their jobs.

That is all I will say on the subject at this time. I wish to go on to another matter.

ARID LANDS OF THE WEST

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the public land problem has been before Congress for 150 years. The objective of the States and the Federal Government, with respect to public-domain lands should be the development of the highest possible taxable value of the property. With that comes the greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens.

It has been the policy of the Congress since the passage of the Preemption Act of 1841 to hold the public lands of the United States in trust for the States until such lands could be passed into private ownership and put on the tax rolls of the respective States.

Mr. President, Government supervision is necessary for forest reservations and other public lands of considerable value. Permits granted to the people using such lands for grazing in connection with the patented feed-producing lands are limited in time and extent and therefore there is no assurance that any livestock unit will remain intact.

These lands remained in public ownership because they could not be taken up under any existing congressional act.

THREE FACTORS IN LIVESTOCK UNIT PLAN

The livestock units in arid areas are affected by three factors, all related. First, there are the patented feed-producing lands in those areas; second, there are water rights both for irrigation and stock-watering purposes; and third, we have the spring, summer, fall, and winter grazing lands.

The latitude and elevation of an area determine the climate and, therefore, the category into which the area falls. The law provides that the fees charged and method of use are subject to change at the discretion of the supervising department, whether it be the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior.

140 ACRES FOR EACH COW UNIT

Some time ago, the United States Geological Survey made a survey of arid lands in the mountain States, and in States such as my own State of Nevada it was determined that it required an individual average of 140 acres for a cow unit per year. A cow and a calf are considered as a cow unit. It required an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit, a ewe and a lamb.

When we say 140 acres to a cow unit or 40 acres to a sheep unit, it does not mean the maximum or the minimum, but the average. There is some very good range, mostly in the forest reserves, where a very small area will take care of a sheep unit or of a cow unit, while, at the same time, there are areas, particularly in the southern part of Nevada, where it is impossible for a cow or a sheep to walk far enough in a day to get enough to eat.

Some of the areas which the Department of the Interior considers necessary to supervise have been used for 60 or 70 years by the owners in rounded out units, and they have made beneficial use of all the lands over which it is possible for cattle and sheep to graze. There is no feed value whatever except that which can be harvested through the livestock.

Therefore, inasmuch as the livestock owner does not control all three factors, he is not considered a good credit risk at his bank, and must fall back upon the returns from the forced sale of his livestock, or Government loans.

The public ranges have been taxed through the owned feed producing ranches for 60 years inasmuch as the taxable value of such owned lands was dependent upon the third factor of the livestock unit, the range.

160-ACRE LIMIT NOT SUITABLE FOR ARID LANDS

The Homestead Act, providing for the application to the Government for 160 acres of land upon payment of a \$16 filing fee, worked very well in the agricultural areas of what became the Wheat and Corn Belt. However, when the western semiarid and arid lands were reached, the conditions were so different that it was finally made possible for an individual to file upon as much as 960 acres, including the additional homestead and the grazing homestead.

In western mountain States, where rainfall is so light that it requires up to 140 acres for a cow unit, according to the United States Geological Survey, 960 acres would only run 7 or 8 head of cattle. Therefore, it is readily seen we are considering townships rather than sections when we discuss a family unit of 200 to 300 head of cattle or a band of sheep, running from 1,500 to 2,000 head. There is so much difference in the carrying capacity and value of these lands that no uniform method has ever been devised by Congress for filing upon the lands with the idea of private ownership.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nevada on his speech with respect to the arid lands of the West. Few Senators on the floor of the Senate, or occupants of the galleries, appreciate the magnitude of the question which confronts the State of the Senator from Nevada, of the Senator from Idaho, and the other Western States.

Does the Senator from Nevada know of some of the bright boys in the Bureau of Land Management who went into the State of Idaho a few months ago and cut one of our best ranges from 40 to 75 percent, due, they alleged, to the overgrazing by the cattle industry in that particular area?

Would the Senator be alarmed to know that notwithstanding the fact that they cut these life-long producers of cattle 40 to 75 percent, when they realized that there was an abundance of grass and feed on the same range, permitted an outsider, a man from a far distant area, a man who had never grazed cattle or sheep in that area, to come within that region and usurp the rights of our private owners to graze the grass, the grass of which the permanent owner had been deprived by the arbitrary action of the Bureau of Land Management?

ONLY WAY TO HARVEST THE FEED IN DESERT

Mr. MALONE. I would say, in answer, that for 40 years the junior Senator from Nevada has been familiar

with the arid ranges, and how they are utilized by the cattle and sheep, the only manner of utilization possible, the only way to harvest the feed in the mountains and deserts of this sparse-feed country, where the annual rainfall ranges from only 3 inches to a high of 12 or 14 inches.

Can the Members of the Senate visualize a desert area where one might drive 50 or 100 miles without seeing a habitation, where the rainfall is only 3, 5, or 6 inches, and that mostly in the wintertime, when the snow comes. There is often no rain at all during the summer, except for a cloudburst in the mountains, and that does more harm than good when it washes out deep ravines and floods the valleys. Usually there is no available feed at all in those desert areas except in the winter, when the grazing stock eat snow for water.

"EXPERTS" DO GREAT HARM

The uninitiated, when they go there, are unable to see any feed at all. As a matter of fact, when we send one of these theoretical grazing men turned out by the eastern schools into that area, and he gets away from the towns, he is amazed and horrified that people are living in a country such as Nevada or Idaho. Of course, he makes out all right where there is a concentration of population, night clubs, and things of that sort; he understands that kind of life, but rarely the range.

The junior Senator from Nevada in the early days walked over most of the mountains and deserts of Nevada, and a good share of Idaho, California, and Utah, carrying a transit.

Nevada is the sixth largest State in the Union, containing more than 110,000 square miles. The nature of the lands is almost incomprehensible to an easterner or middle westerner.

As the junior Senator from Idaho has said, almost irreparable harm has been done by those men who could see no connection between the ranches and the feed-producing lands. They could not see that the ranches had no value without the range, the third factor in the livestock unit.

In a meeting of grazing men not so long ago, the head grazer of a Government-grazing district cornered a livestock man who had been born on the range, and asked him, "Just who is the best judge of the time when this range ought to be used, and the number of livestock to be put on a certain piece of range?" The old man, without hesitation said, "The cow."

SIZE OF RANGE DETERMINED BY WATER

There are little ranches in the mountains, the size determined by the amount of water coming down in the spring and carrying over through the summer. If there is no late water they have only grass hay. Sometimes alfalfa will be grown, and sometimes a little grain if there is enough water late in the summer. But, generally speaking, the ranches are limited to grass hay.

Ordinarily the ranchers figure about a ton to a cow unit, and if they do not use it this year, they leave it in stacks for next year. If the owner does not

have enough, he will lose some of his stock. Our people recently went through a bad year.

UNIT PLAN INTERFERED WITH

Government individuals interfere with the livestock unit, whereby a man with, say, 100 head or 150 head of stock would sell off a little during a dry period and increase his herds during a wet cycle.

The rancher has the feed-producing unit to produce hay for the heavy winter; he has the spring, summer, fall, and winter rains; and he has his water rights and feed-producing lands. Those three factors make up the livestock unit. Anyone who interferes with any one of the three factors does an irreparable harm to the livestock unit. Much harm can come from taking away a part of the range, thus reducing the carrying capacity of the unit, without reducing the investment. The results of work over a period of 40 or 50 or 60 years can be ruined forever.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Can the Senator advise me what recourse, if any, the cattle raiser, the sheep raiser, or the livestock producer has in the arid West when he is told by the United States Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, "You will cut down your grazing herds from 40 to 75 percent"? All during that time we see gentlemen dressed in green driving jeeps around our terrain investigating the area, with the intention of building green park benches, public rest rooms, and swimming pools all over the public domain which has made the intermountain area a great livestock producing area. What relief have the cattle men of the West in view of such dictatorial practices?

PROTECT LIVESTOCK UNIT

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I would say that I am about to introduce a bill which would make a special case of certain dry ranges in southern Nevada. It would embrace about 7,250,000 acres. It would protect the livestock unit as it now exists, with full protection and conservation of recreation, fish, wildlife, mineral resources, and agriculture.

Under existing conditions the livestock producer has no protection. The forest reserves are set up and dominated by people of the eastern States. They are dominated by the eastern States simply because there were more forest reserves in the eastern States. They started there. Thirty or forty years ago there was no protection for grazing. There being no range protection and no protective State laws, those in charge of the forest reserves were asked to come in and take over the summer ranges in many of the western States. Some large areas which had no forests at all were included.

Under the forest reserve or Taylor Grazing Act system, there is no protection to the stockman; the word of the ranger is final. If he says to the livestock producer that he must reduce his herds by half, the livestock producer has

to reduce them by half. And it is well known that many of these official rangers have no understanding of the necessity for preserving the herds over a dry period, and cutting them down gradually so as not to break the rancher, allowing him to build up again over the same area when the cycle starts the other way.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT INVADDED WEST

Then the Taylor Grazing Act invaded the West. Under it the carrying capacity of the permittee can be cut in the same manner as in the forest reserve areas. Also, the fees may be raised at any time it is desired by Government officials. The Forest Service and the Taylor Grazing Act Administration, now called the Bureau of Land Management, have complete control over one of the three factors of the livestock unit, therefore they control the entire operation.

Up until the time Mr. Ickes came into office it had been the policy of the United States Government to hold in trust the public lands for the States until such time as they could be taken up under some existing or proposed congressional act.

CHANGE OF ESTABLISHED POLICY

Mr. Ickes changed the policy. He found about 170,000,000 acres in the West, including 5,000,000 acres of forest reserve and 55,000,000 acres of public land in Nevada alone. So he immediately changed the policy. From that time on we were to save for the United States Government all the lands which theretofore had been held for the States for ultimate private ownership. The lands were now to be in Federal Government ownership in perpetuity.

Then there began a program of "improvement" for the benefit of tourists. The State of Nevada, the State of Idaho, and other States were to be the happy hunting ground of people on the move. The Federal Government forgot all about the development of taxable property in and for the States and the Government.

The only way the small amount of feed on these ranges can be utilized is through grazing livestock. Therefore the lands in the State of Nevada, particularly when they are used in the natural manner, through feed-producing ranches, fall into units, running from a few head of livestock to several thousand, or from a small band of sheep to several bands of sheep.

No method could be utilized for breaking up these large units unless the range could be transferred along with the sale of the feed-producing ranches. Therefore, when the Government retains full control of the range, preventing its transfer in conjunction with the feed-producing ranches, it prevents the very thing which it pretends to want, namely the breaking up of the large livestock units in the West.

If we can work out a method such as the junior Senator from Nevada is about to propose, so that the range can be transferred from the present user to a user who will purchase a part of the feed-producing ranch, without diminution, the oversize livestock units will naturally break up into smaller units.

MALONE BILL (S. 2341) TO ESTABLISH A GRAZING DISTRICT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada, not affecting other States or other areas in the State of Nevada, to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes, and request that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2341) to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the conservation and development of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to establish a Nevada special grazing district, and to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation purposes, and for other purposes.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a Nevada special grazing district (hereinafter referred to as the "grazing district"), which shall consist of the following described public lands situated in Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nev., exclusive of national forests, Indian reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and shall include the following described lands:

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

T. 10 N., R. 35 E., that part in Nye County. Tps. 9 and 10 N., R. 36 E., unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 8 to 12 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 14 and 15 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Tps. 7 to 19 N., R. 38 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 N., R. 39 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 4 to 8, 12 to 14 and 16 to 28 N., R. 40 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 N., R. 41 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 N., R. 42 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 N., R. 43 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 8, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 N., R. 44 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 N., R. 45 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3, 7 to 14, and 17 to 32 N., R. 46 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 32 N., R. 47 E., partly unsurveyed. T. 8 N., R. 47½ E.

Tps. 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 N., R. 48 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 24 and 25 N., R. 48½ E.

Tps. 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 N., R. 49 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 4 and 5 N., R. 49½ E.

Tps. 1 to 26 N., Rs. 50 and 51 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3 N., R. 51½ E.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 52 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 53 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 N., R. 54 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 N., R. 55 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 4, 5, 6, and 9 N., R. 56 E.

Tps. 5, 6, 7, and 9 N., R. 57 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 6 to 9 N., R. 58 E., unsurveyed.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), through the Bureau of Land Management, shall, upon the application of one or more range users within the district, conduct a survey of the lands comprising the grazing district for the purpose of ascertaining and determining the boundaries of the portion or portions of such lands which heretofore have been customarily used for grazing purposes by each person who on such date is using any of such lands for such purpose. Upon such adjudication, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall grant to each such person a permit authorizing such person hereafter to use for grazing purposes the portion or portions of such land heretofore customarily used by such person for such purpose. Each permit so issued shall specify the boundaries of the land with respect to which such permit is effective.

(b) If the person to whom any such permit is issued customarily has, prior to the effective date of this act, enjoyed exclusive use of any such land for grazing purposes, he shall be tendered an exclusive permit which shall entitle the holder to exclusive use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein. If such person customarily has, prior to such date, used any such land for grazing purposes jointly with any other person or persons, there shall be issued a joint permit which shall entitle the holders thereof to joint use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein.

(c) The issuance of any permit pursuant to this section shall constitute a revocation of any permit previously issued by the Secretary under any other provision of law for the use for grazing purposes of the lands described in the permit issued hereunder.

(d) Any permit issued pursuant to this section may be revoked by the Secretary upon his determination, after notice and hearing, that—

(1) the holder or holders thereof have failed for a period of 2 years to make substantial use for grazing purposes of the land described therein; or

(2) the lands described therein are required for use, under any other provision of law for any use (including, but not limited to, agricultural, mining, fish and wildlife, recreation and conservation uses) other than grazing, and that the continued use of such land for grazing purposes will substantially interfere with its employment for such other intended use.

SEC. 4. (a) As soon as may be practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall give notice, by publication or otherwise, to all persons who heretofore, have customarily used for grazing purposes any of the lands comprising the grazing district, concerning—

(1) the time and place at which such persons may file applications for the issuance of permits hereunder; and

(2) the time and place at which a hearing or hearings will be conducted for the purpose of ascertaining the facts upon which

the adjudications required by section 2 (a) of this act will be made.

(b) Each such application shall specify (1) the location of the lands of the applicant and the number of acres contained therein, (2) the location and number of acres of the lands within the grazing district for which application is made, and (3) water rights, including domestic stock watering, irrigation, mining or industrial permits, certificates or applications pending under the State laws; and vested rights claimed, and (4) owned or leased lands within the area applied for including commensurate feed producing property, and (5) such other facts as may be prescribed by the Secretary in order to enable him to make an equitable determination of all applications.

(c) In making adjudications pursuant to section 2 (a) of this act, the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, comply with the designations of the applicants with respect to the division of lands within the grazing district, but notwithstanding the designation of specific lands by any applicant, the Secretary may issue to such applicant a permit for the use of other lands. In any case in which more than one person makes application for the use of the same lands within the grazing district, the Secretary shall determine the priority of such rights, and if determined to be equal, shall endeavor to effect an agreement among such persons with respect to the division of such lands or to the joint use thereof. In any case in which a person's application for the use of designated lands is denied, in whole or in part, such person may amend his application to include other lands, upon application to the Secretary.

(d) Any person who has filed any such application, and who is aggrieved by any adjudication made by the Secretary thereon, may within sixty days after receipt of notice of such adjudication file in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada a civil action for a determination of his rights under this act, and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and to issue such order as shall be determined by such court to be proper. Any order so entered shall be subject to review pursuant to sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the surrender, transfer, and assignment of permits, but no such rule or regulation shall prohibit (1) the transfer of a permit, or (2) the assignment of a permit, or the assignment of the right to use a portion of the lands covered by such permit, or, in the case of a joint permit, the assignment of a part of the lessor's right to the use of such lands, to a lessee of the lands, or portion thereof, owned by the holder of such permit.

(b) Upon the application of two or more persons holding permits for the use of the lands concerned, the Secretary may modify any permit with respect to (1) the extent of the lands covered by such permit or (2), in the case of a joint permit, the number of users of the lands covered by such permit. Before making any such modification, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the rights and privileges of any other person or persons holding a permit, and may deny the application when such rights and privileges would be adversely affected by the modification requested.

SEC. 6. (a) In case of any dispute between two or more persons holding permits under this act, the Secretary shall, at the written request of any party to such dispute, determine the rights and privileges of the respective parties under their permits. The Secretary shall hold such hearings and re-

ceive such testimony as he deems necessary for a proper determination of any such dispute. If the Secretary should find any infringement by any party to such proceeding of the permit of another person, he shall issue such orders and take such action as may be necessary to correct such infringement.

(b) Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to enjoin (1) any violation of an order of the Secretary issued under subsection (a) and (2) any infringement by a person who is not a holder of a permit issued under this act or the rights and privileges of any person under a permit issued under this act.

SEC. 7. Except as specifically required by this act, the Secretary shall not exercise any supervision over the activities of any person holding a permit, and, except as specifically required by other laws, shall not exercise any supervision over the lands comprising the grazing district with respect to the use of such lands for grazing purposes. Nothing contained in this act shall preclude the exercise by the Secretary or any other officer of the United States of his authority under any other act (other than the Taylor Grazing Act) with respect to the development or preservation of the natural resources of the public domain.

The actual costs attributable to the initial determination and adjudication of such rights and the issuance of permits under this act shall be apportioned equally among the five fiscal years following the fiscal years in which such costs are incurred.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to advance in carrying out the provisions of this act. Such necessary expense for adjudication purposes to be returned to the Treasury of the United States as herein provided.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 15, 1951, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, established Grazing District No. 6, which would be affected by the bill I have just introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the order of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, establishing Grazing District No. 6, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

[Misc. 57324]

NEVADA

Established Grazing District No. 6

FEBRUARY 9, 1951.

Under and pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269, 43 U. S. C. 315 et seq.) as amended, known as the Taylor Grazing Act, and in accordance with Departmental Order No. 2583 of August 16, 1950, § 2.22 (15 F. R. 5645) Nevada Grazing District 6 is hereby established, the exterior boundaries of which shall include the following described lands exclusive of National Forests, Indian Reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and existing grazing districts:

NEVADA—MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

T. 10 N., R. 35 E., that part in Nye County.
Tps. 9 and 10 N., R. 36 E., unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 8 to 12 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 14 and 15 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Tps. 7 to 19 N., R. 38 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 N., R. 39 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 4 to 8, 12 to 14, and 16 to 28 N., R. 40 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 N., R. 41 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 N., R. 42 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 N., R. 43 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 8, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 N., R. 44 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 N., R. 45 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3, 7 to 14, and 17 to 32 N., R. 46 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 32 N., R. 47 E., partly unsurveyed.

T. 8 N., R. 47½ E.

Tps. 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 N., R. 48 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 24 and 25 N., R. 48½ E.

Tps. 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 N., R. 49 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 4 and 5 N., R. 49½ E.

Tps. 1 to 26 N., Rs. 50 and 51 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3 N., R. 51½ E.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 52 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 53 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 N., R. 54 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 N., R. 55 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 4, 5, 6, and 9 N., R. 56 E.

Tps. 5, 6, 7, and 9 N., R. 57 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 6 to 9 N., R. 58 E., unsurveyed.

The area described includes approximately 7,367,000 acres of public lands.

The Federal Range Code for Grazing Districts (43 CFR, Part 161) as amended, shall be effective as to the lands embraced herein from and after the date of publication of this order in the Federal Register, except that the lands embraced herein shall not be subject to section 161.8, paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e), until 1 year from the date of such publication.

MARION CLAWSON,

Director.

[F. R. Doc. 51-2216; filed, Feb. 14, 1951; 8:45 a. m.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter written by me under date of December 20, 1950, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1950.

HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with our conversation dealing with the remaining lean desert-range areas located in the three counties of Lander, Eureka, and Nye in my State of Nevada, I am attaching an

outline of suggested legislation that could furnish a feasible approach to the problem.

I am advised that there are 7,367,000 acres included in the area divided between the three counties as follows:

Lander County	2,445,502
Eureka County	1,357,806
Nye County	3,563,692

Total 7,367,000

The approximately 200 acres to the cow unit annually, that your people estimate is necessary on the average—some areas will require much more and some less—just about approaches the "roller skate" requirement for the cow to cover that much area in time to get enough to eat.

The new approach for this thin production area is not proposed as a cure-all but simply as a method for your department to bridge an impossible situation where you cannot possibly charge enough rental for the use of such lands, to return the cost of supervision to the Government.

This approach will provide a method for the Government to become entirely familiar with the actual conditions—to advise in the matter of mining development, fish and game conservation and the development of the recreation facilities, without injuring the established livestock units, which I am sure is your real objective.

If you agree with me that the new approach should be tried out and in the event it does not merit continuation after a reasonable time, I will personally advocate the repeal of the legislation and in no event is any other area affected by the special act.

I will await your call to further discuss the details and will introduce the proper legislation when we are agreed upon procedure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum written by the Assistant Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C. December 26, 1950.

Memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior.

From Assistant Director.

Subject: Nevada Grazing District No. 6.

Tabulated below is the information requested by telephone covering precipitation and average grazing capacity in Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nevada:

County:	Rain in inches
Eureka	per annum
Lander	6.26-12.17
Nye	6.17-12.22
	3.07-12.29

Source: Weather Bureau.

Carrying capacity: Estimated average, 12 acres per animal-unit month.

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, Jr.
Assistant Director.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table issued by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, showing the area in acres

of vacant public lands in the State of Nevada. The table is dated June 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—area, in acres, of vacant public lands, by States and counties, June 30, 1949—Nevada

Counties	Outside grazing districts	Within grazing districts
Churchill		2,113,270
Clark	95,081	2,487,470
Douglas		198,994
Elko		5,985,860
Esmeralda	2,011,285	
Eureka	1,357,806	519,064
Humboldt	110,718	4,108,618
Lander	2,445,502	142,548
Lincoln	94,365	5,270,201
Lyon	280	656,438
Mineral		1,566,351
Nye	5,093,579	1,325,596
Ormsby		49,190
Pershing	137,480	2,640,929
Storey		77,417
Washoe	146,760	2,406,217
White Pine		4,347,877
Total, Nevada	11,492,856	33,896,040

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to read from page 87 of the report of the State engineer of Nevada for the period January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1932, inclusive. I may say that it is my own report, as I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935. I read as follows:

It is not generally realized by people of the midwest and eastern States just how small our western development really is in comparison to the total development of the United States, or the obstacles that must be surmounted for further development.

Nevada, for example, has a total area of 70,285,440 acres, of which less than 500,000 acres are actually under cultivation, or approximately three-quarters of 1 percent (0.75 percent). The total irrigated acreage in the 17 Western States is approximately 18,500,000 acres, which is, in itself, insignificant compared to the estimated total of 400,000,000 cultivated acres in the United States. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of the 18,500,000 have been brought under cultivation on the Government reclamation projects.

Mr. President, the report is dated 1933. It will be understood, therefore, that there has been some increase in acreage since the time the report was written. I read further:

Our policy with respect to utilization is outlined in detail under "The State Range Commission," on page 71, but in general our policy with respect to national legislation has been to have it so drawn that our State laws in this connection would be recognized when they were not discriminatory between the States, and that such legislation would not be operative except by the request of the State involved or the actual users of such range, feeling that we would be amply protected in that event, and at the same time would not be preventing other States from securing such supervision as they might desire.

This was the policy of the State Range Commission.

STATE RANGE COMMISSION

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the

marked excerpts of the State Engineer's report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislature created what is known as the State range commission in 1929 for the purpose of determining and reporting to the 1931 legislature the "principles, laws, or policies that should apply to the grazing user of the natural range forage resources of the publicly owned lands within Nevada * * * that should prevail for the best public interest." The State engineer was made a member of that body by law. The report of this commission, dated March 4, 1931, to the Legislature of the State of Nevada follows:

The commission: Hon. F. B. Balzar, governor, chairman; Hon. J. F. Shaughnessy, secretary, Hon. George W. Malone, State engineer, member.

CONCLUSIONS

1. That the highest development of the livestock industry of the State is dependent upon the proper use of the public lands for grazing purposes.

2. That such proper use is only possible to the extent that a user or users can be assured of the benefits from his or their particular range.

3. That the present economic set-up, including existing equities and investments, must not be disturbed.

4. That future prospecting and mining, and water development for irrigation purposes must not be disturbed.

5. That any method of range unit control must provide like protection to all rightful users, regardless of the size of such units.

6. That the taxable value of the outlying ranches used for livestock purposes is directly dependent upon the range factor of the livestock unit.

7. That, if protection is afforded such range units, agreements will be made, in the case of more than one user entitled to the same range, and that the result will be the building up of the range values in accordance with good practice.

8. That, if encroachments upon the legitimate user or users are prevented, then further improvements will be made upon the ranges, particularly the development of water for stock-watering purposes upon the winter ranges, where large investments for this purpose are necessary.

9. That if a method can be found for the protection of range units by legislative action, allowing the economic trends of the industry to develop, it would be unsound to invite supervision of the ranges by either the Federal Government or State, necessitating large expenditures by these agencies and a corresponding tax upon the livestock industry.

BASIS OF POLICY

It is concluded, however, that any method adopted must provide a system or policy that will, over a period of years, develop along the following general lines:

1. That the maximum taxable property and business revenues may be developed in the State through this natural resource, pending the time that the public lands may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws, with due regard to the expense and efficiency of such system.

2. That due to the requirements of the industry upon these lands of little value, requiring as they do in most cases balanced winter, summer, spring and fall ranges and ranch units, these economic units developed over a long period of years must not be upset, and that any method adopted must encourage development along the natural trends of the industry.

3. That prospecting and mining for minerals, nonmetallic products and other re-

sources, or legitimate homesteading of lands where water may be developed, either surface or underground, for irrigation purposes must not be interfered with in any manner.

4. That any method adopted must provide the same protection for all livestock units, regardless of the size of such units.

There are approximately 55,000,000 acres of unreserved, unappropriated public domain in Nevada, in addition to approximately 5,000,000 acres within the Forest Reserve boundaries and of the unreserved area. Government reports show that an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit and 140 acres for a cow unit are required for grazing purposes. The low feed value of these areas creates a unique condition on the Nevada public domain that must be met.

The maximum of taxable property and business revenues can only be developed through the natural conditions surrounding the industry. It has been demonstrated in this State that a livestock unit must consist of a balanced summer, winter, fall and spring range. The winter range may consist all or in part of ranching property where sufficient feed can be raised to take care of the stock through the winter season. These ranches must be balanced against, the range units.

The value of the outlying ranches, where transportation conditions make it infeasible to raise agricultural products for the market, is dependent upon the range units. It is well known that the taxable values of the ranches is directly dependent upon the value of such range unit, and that when any of the range is lost, the carrying capacity of the unit is decreased without a decrease in the investment, the value of the whole unit thus being impaired.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That any public land legislation passed by the Congress of the United States should recognize policies and methods adopted by the State law regulating the movement of livestock on the public domain that are not discriminatory between the States.

2. That the operation of any method inaugurated by the Congress, providing for supervision of such public lands, should be made optional with the State involved or with associations or districts made up of the "established users" of such range lands.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a marked excerpt from a memorandum entitled "Vacant Public Lands, Areas by States, and Other Information," issued by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

The excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC-LAND LAWS

The principal public-land laws governing the acquisition of title to vacant public lands are as follows:

1. The homestead laws permit acquisition of agricultural lands through settlement, cultivation, and improvement. For further information, request Information Bulletin No. 3 and Circular No. 1728.

2. The desert-land laws permit acquisition of arid, irrigable lands through cultivation, improvement, and payment of \$1.25 per acre. For further information, request Circular No. 1731.

3. The public-sale laws permit acquisition at public auction of isolated tracts and rough and mountainous tracts at not less than their appraised value. For further information, request Circular No. 1732.

4. The mining laws permit acquisition of mineral lands after valid discovery and development of specified minerals. For further information, request Circular No. 1278.

5. For general information on acquisition of vacant public lands in Alaska, request Information Bulletin No. 2.

6. For veterans' rights and privileges, request Circular No. 1720.

The principal public-land laws governing the leasing of vacant public lands are as follows:

1. The Taylor Grazing Act permits use of forage lands outside of grazing districts under lease. For further information, request Circular No. 1705.

2. The Small-Tract Act permits use under lease of not more than five acres of lands chiefly suitable for home, health, recreational, convalescent, cabin, camp, and business sites. The leases often contain an option to purchase at appraised value at the expiration of 1 year. For further information, request Circular No. 1724.

3. The mineral-leasing laws permit exploitation of specified minerals upon payment of rentals and royalties. For further information, request circulars governing the mineral in which you are interested.

The regulations covering the acquisition of title to, or rights in, the vacant public lands under the above acts and other laws are published in title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations of the United States of America, copies of which can be found in many local libraries.

AREA OF VACANT PUBLIC LANDS

The following tabulation shows the area of vacant public lands, by States, as of June 30, 1949:

Area of vacant public lands, as of June 30, 1949 (in acres)

State	Outside of grazing districts	Within grazing districts	Total
Alabama.....	27,358	27,358
Arizona.....	2,447,718	10,348,968	12,796,686
Arkansas.....	136,023	136,023
California.....	13,429,073	2,862,054	16,291,127
Colorado.....	660,730	7,431,260	8,091,990
Florida.....	24,248	24,248
Idaho.....	483,433	10,643,438	11,126,871
Indiana.....	11	11
Kansas.....	3,023	3,023
Louisiana.....	7,335	7,335
Michigan.....	15,646	15,646
Minnesota.....	93,125	93,125
Mississippi.....	17,577	17,577
Missouri.....	1,004	1,004
Montana.....	1,541,331	5,233,533	6,774,864
Nebraska.....	28,717	28,717
Nevada.....	11,492,856	33,896,040	45,388,896
New Mexico.....	507,016	14,144,627	14,651,643
North Dakota.....	98,000	98,000
Oklahoma.....	25,957	25,957
Oregon.....	911,815	12,001,109	12,912,924
South Dakota.....	318,768	318,768
Utah.....	297,423	23,768,142	24,065,565
Washington.....	493,278	493,278
Wisconsin.....	6,151	6,151
Wyoming.....	3,099,889	13,504,330	16,604,219
Total.....	36,167,505	133,833,501	170,001,006

In addition to these lands, there are approximately 270,000,000 acres of vacant public lands in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article entitled "First Advisory Board Meeting of Central Nevada Grazing District No. 6, Held in Austin," published in a recent issue of the Eureka Sentinel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST ADVISORY BOARD MEETING OF CENTRAL NEVADA GRAZING DISTRICT NO. 6 HELD IN AUSTIN

First advisory board meeting of the Central Nevada Grazing District No. 6 was held at Austin, Tuesday, September 18. This board was elected at Tonopah in May and consist

of six sheepmen and six cattle representatives.

The sheep representatives are: Pete Elia, Elko; Tony Smith, Tonopah; Frank Arcularius, Honopah; Phil Etcheverry, Eureka; Stanley Ellison, Tuscarora; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka.

Cattle representatives are: Dick Magee, Austin; Charles Damele, Eureka; Charles Keogh, Tonopah; Emil Walti, Eureka; Henry Filippini, Battle Mountain; Jack Bordoli, Tonopah.

The meeting opened at 10 o'clock a. m., with Boyd Hammond, Assistant Regional Chief, and Monte Rohwer, Range Manager, representing the Bureau of Land Management, conducting the meeting.

The chief purpose of this meeting was to organize the board, to elect chairman, vice chairman, and secretary.

Dick Magree was elected chairman; Charles Damele, vice chairman and Frank Arcularius, secretary.

Two members selected from the advisory board to serve on the State grazing board were Charles Keogh of Tonopah, representing the cattlemen, with Charles Damele of Eureka his alternate; Tony Smith of Tonopah, sheep representative, with Frank Arcularius as his alternate.

The Federal range code, under which the Taylor Grazing Act is administered, was discussed with respect to the duties of advisory board members and general provisions on the qualifications of livestock operation on the Federal range.

Applications for grazing privileges for the 1952 grazing season will be mailed soon to applicants, to be followed up with field meetings to be held in the various towns of the new district where representatives of the department will be available to aid those who wish assistance.

These meetings are scheduled as follows: Battle Mountain, October 2-5; Austin, October 15-19; Tonopah, October 20-26; Eureka, October 29 to November 2.

It was announced that Battle Mountain has been selected as the office city for the new grazing district.

Meetings will be held in more centrally located towns as needed to eliminate as much trouble as possible for livestock operation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Nevada's New Grazing District in Operation," published in the Pioche Record of September 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA'S NEW GRAZING DISTRICT IN OPERATION—7,250,000 ACRES IN CENTRAL NEVADA NOW UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL

RENO.—Actual operation of central Nevada's huge newly created grazing district began last week when a meeting of the advisory board and representatives of the Bureau of Land Management met at Austin. Announcement was made by Luther T. Hoffman, regional administrator of San Francisco.

The new grazing district, which is the fifty-ninth and last established by the Bureau of Land Management, was set up on February 9, 1951. The action drew loud and vehement protest from many Nevada cattle and sheep men, but they were of no avail.

The new Nevada grazing district No. 6, totaling more than 7,250,000 acres of public domain lands in Nye, Lander, and Eureka Counties, is the last of the large public-land areas to come under regulated use according to terms of the Taylor Grazing Act passed by Congress in 1934.

ELECTION HELD IN MAY

The meeting at Austin followed the advisory board election of May 10, when six

cattlemen and six sheepmen were elected by the livestock operators to represent them in acting on their applications for licenses or permits to graze livestock on the Federal ranges.

Those elected to the board were: Cattlemen—Richard Magee, Austin; Charles Damele, Eureka; Emil Walti, Beowawe; Charles Keogh, Tonopah; Henry Filippini, Battle Mountain; Alfred Bordoli, Tonopah. Sheepmen—Frank Arcularius, Tonopah; Filbert Etcheverry, Eureka; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka; Pete Elia, Elko; Stanley Ellison, Tuscarora; and Tony Smith, Salt Lake City.

The purpose of the first meeting was to elect officers of the board, representatives to the State advisory board council and discuss plans for getting the district under way in issuing grazing leases for the coming year.

OFFICERS NAMED

As officers of the new board, Richard Magee of Austin was elected chairman; Charles Damele of Eureka, vice chairman, and Frank Arcularius of Tonopah as board secretary.

To represent the district and the State advisory board council, Charles Keogh was elected to represent the cattlemen with Charles Damele as alternate cattle representatives.

Sheep representative to the State council is to be filled by Tony Smith with Frank Arcularius, Jr., as alternate.

The Bureau of Land Management was represented at the meeting by Boyd Hammond, regional chief, branch of grazing; and Monte Rohwer, range manager, both of Carson City.

E. R. Greenslet, regional chief of range management, said that plans were made to meet the livestock operators during October to assist them in filling out their grazing applications. The regular advisory board meeting to act on the applications will be held early in December.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev. Eureka County is one of the counties which contains a considerable area of land affected by the bill introduced by me. The resolution was passed on April 5, 1951. It is signed by Charles Damele, chairman, and J. T. Smith and Mary R. Bailey, members. It is attested by Ed Delaney, the county clerk.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev., after hearing the sentiments and opinions expressed by various livestock growers of central Nevada; various mining operators, and members of local fish and game associations, concerning certain legislation now being introduced by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, in the United States Senate, decided that in view of the unanimous desire of the aforesaid groups to have such legislation favorable considered, to communicate with the said Senator MALONE and by resolution commend the principle of the legislation he is now introducing dealing with an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands, based on the customary use of such lands by the users thereof. Whereupon, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev., hereby resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"That a resolution be prepared and transmitted to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator of Nevada, endorsing and recommending favorable consideration and

action upon the pending legislation now, or soon to be introduced in Congress, whereby such legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands, based upon the customary use of such lands by the users thereof; that such range lands shall be free of intervention by adjudicating officials working with a view toward redistributing such range, or making any charge whatsoever for its use.

"That this board feels Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of such legislation.

"That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev., under date of May 5, 1951, and that a copy thereof be sent immediately to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seal this 5th day of April 1951.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF EUREKA COUNTY, NEV.,

CHARLES DAMELE,
Chairman.
J. T. SMITH,
Member.
MARY R. BAILEY,
Member.

Attest:

ED DELANEY, County Clerk.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., after reviewing and hearing the sentiments and opinions expressed by farm and livestock groups at and within said county, concerning certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate, by Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, decided in view of such unanimous approval in regard to said legislation, to communicate with the said Senator MALONE, and express the approval of the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., with the principles of such legislation, whereby range lands will be adjudicated on a fair and intelligent basis of customary use of such lands by the bona fide users thereof; that no adjudicating officials will have the power to redistribute range lands, or charge for the use thereof. Whereupon, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., hereby resolves as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"That a resolution be prepared and transmitted to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator of Nevada, endorsing and recommending favorable consideration and action upon the pending legislation now, or soon to be introduced in Congress, whereby such legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range land, based upon the customary use of such lands by the users thereof; that such range lands shall be free of intervention by adjudicating officials, working with a view toward redistributing such range, or making any charge whatsoever for its use.

"That this bureau feels Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of such legislation.

"That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE."

Witness our hands and seal this 5th day of April 1951.

FARM BUREAU OF EUREKA COUNTY, NEV.,
CHRIS ZUMWALT,
President.

Attest:

WILLIAM MARSHALL,
Vice President.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a petition addressed to me signed by residents and citizens of Eureka County, Nev.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned residents and citizens of Eureka County, Nev., and businessmen engaged in various business ventures at and within said county, have been definitely informed that the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, has now, or proposes in the immediate future to introduce certain legislation in the United States Senate that will have a very important bearing on the future of the public range lands, thereby affecting our livestock industry; mining industry, and fish and game preservation; that said legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; that such legislation will also provide that no adjudicating officials can redistribute such range lands, or charge for their use.

We, the undersigned residents, citizens, and businessmen of Eureka County, in recognition of the importance of such legislation in protecting the aforesaid industries, do hereby respectfully petition Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, to exert every effort in support of said legislation, with the assurance that we, the undersigned, commend and support such legislation.

In witness whereof we hereby sign our names this 14th day of April 1951.

Johnson W. Lloyd; Hiram Kitchen; A. F. Beale; J. B. Beale; Isadore Sara, Jr.; Victor Berinana; Joe Lorholus; Fred J. Eather; McCrawford; Martin M. Ford; Charles Vaccaro; Jason V. Hooper; J. B. Reballath; Rex Oxborow; J. B. Ruterma; Peter Laboule; Fred Jaurequay; all of Eureka, Nev.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution of the Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc. The resolution was adopted on April 9, 1951, and it is signed by LeRoy W. Etchegaray, president; Pete Etcheveny, director; and Mrs. Juanita Damele, secretary.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., in and for the county of Eureka, State of Nevada, at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held at Eureka, Nev., on this 9th day of April, 1951, with a large majority of all members present, and with President LeRoy Etchegaray, presiding, and all other officers present, went into the matter of range and water conditions, and particularly certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate by the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada. The said Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., has been definitely informed that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is, at the present date,

introducing legislation in the United States Senate that will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that said legislation introduced by Senator MALONE will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement of interlopers; that such legislation will provide that no adjudicating officials will have authority to redistribute such range, or charge for its use; that said Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., is not now in full possession of the legislation as introduced by Senator MALONE, but being advised as to its principle, and having full confidence in the said GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, do hereby on motion duly made by Jerry Etcheverry, seconded by Bernard Damele, and unanimously carried by vote of all members of the association present, unanimously resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"The Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., in and for the county of Eureka, State of Nevada, at its regular meeting held this 9th day of April 1951, at Eureka, Nev., do hereby unanimously resolve: That a resolution be prepared and sent by this association to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, resolving and setting forth that this association is completely in accord and favor of the legislation he is now introducing in the United States Senate, whereby such legislation has for its purpose a fair and intelligent adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement of interlopers; that such legislation will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that by such legislation no adjudicating officials will have a right to redistribute range lands, or charge for its use; that this association recognizes that Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry, and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of the aforesaid legislation: Therefore it is further unanimously

"Resolved, That the Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., is in complete accord and favor of the legislation introduced by Senator MALONE, and that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of said association; that a copy of such resolution be mailed immediately to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seals, this 9th day of April, 1951.

EUREKA COUNTY LIVESTOCK
GROWERS, INC.,
LEROY W. ETCHEGARAY,
President.
PETE ETCHENVY,
Director.

Attest:

MRS. JUANITA DAMELE,
Secretary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a similar resolution adopted by the Central Nevada Livestock Association, of Central, Nev. The resolution is signed by Richard Magee, president, and Charles Damele, director.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Central Nevada Livestock Association, of Central, Nev., at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held

at Austin, Nev., on this 20th day of April 1951, with a large majority of all members present, and with President Richard Magee, presiding, and all other officers present, went into the matter of range and water conditions, and particularly certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate by the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada. The said Central Nevada Livestock Association, has been definitely informed that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is, at the present date, introducing legislation in the United States Senate that will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that said legislation introduced by Senator MALONE will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement by interlopers; that such legislation will provide that no adjudicating officials will have authority to redistribute such range, or charge for its use; that said Central Nevada Livestock Association is not now in full possession of the context of the legislation as introduced by Senator MALONE, but being advised as to its principle, and having full confidence in the said GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, do hereby on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried by the members hereof, we do unanimously resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"The Central Nevada Livestock Association at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held at Austin, Nev., do hereby unanimously resolve: That a resolution be prepared by this association and sent to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, resolving and setting forth that this association is completely in accord and favor of the legislation he is now introducing in the United States Senate, whereby such legislation has for its purpose a fair and intelligent adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement by interlopers; that such legislation will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that by such legislation no adjudicating officials will have a right to redistribute range lands, or charge for its use; that this association recognizes that Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of the aforesaid legislation: Therefore it is further unanimously

"Resolved, That the Central Nevada Livestock Association, is in complete accord and favor of the legislation introduced by Senator MALONE, and that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of said association; that a copy of such resolution be mailed immediately to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seal this 20th day of April 1951.

CENTRAL NEVADA LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
RICHARD MAGEE, President.
CHARLES DAMELE, Director.

Attest:

MADISON LOCKE,
Secretary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have before me a number of letters and postal cards in support of this measure. These communications have come to me from the citizens and residents of the dis-

trict involved. In order to save the time of the Senate, I will not read these, but I ask unanimous consent to have these letters and postal cards printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and postal cards were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKE'S SERVICE STATION,
Tonopah, Nev., April 21, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand you are introducing some legislation of importance to the mining industry, this legislation being some reform in the management of the public lands.

As the owner of several mining properties in Nevada I am very much in favor of your proposals.

Yours truly,

M. E. LOCKE.

EUREKA, NEV., April 19, 1951.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chambers,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was very much pleased to learn that you were preparing an amendment to the Taylor grazing law. Adjudication of the range land would seem to be the only salvation for the livestock man. As I understand it, your amendment did not take into consideration a per head fee. Do you think that there would be any better chance of getting this amendment before the Senate if it included a reasonable per head fee which had some definite limit? I would not think that the livestock owner would object to the fee providing the restrictions were removed.

As a Eureka County cattleman for close to 60 years (I have operated the Three Bar Ranch for 52 years), I believe I have lived through a period of time which has been a transformation from the old way of life with its attendant freedom, to the present period of Government control by bureaucracy which day by day is becoming more of a crime against the people, not only those in the livestock industry, but those in every walk of life.

Does anyone in their right mind for one moment believe that this country, and by this I mean anything west of the Mississippi, but principally the more arid regions of the West, such as Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and others, would have been settled yet had there been the present restrictions of the SEC law on the miners and the Taylor grazing law to restrict the stockman? Would there have been a Homestake, Butte, Leadville, Custer d'Alene, Bisbee, Virginia City, Goldfield, Tonopah? You know there would not.

Would every little stream, spring, and mudhole that would water a few head of cattle or sheep be taken up and improved? Would every area of sagebrush land that showed a little grass have been improved and made into a home that has supported people in this country up to the third generation? You're damn right it wouldn't.

Perhaps under the present administration, had it existed at that time, subsidies would have been handed out and Government control of the people would have had a 50-year better start. By this time, in all probability, it would have surpassed Russia of the present.

We, the United States, are supposed to be a democracy, with fair and impartial representation in Washington and which we advertise to the rest of the world as a model for them to worship and emulate. What is there to admire, worship, or use as a pattern in our 1951 form of government? This Nation, today, is becoming as corrupt and depraved as France before the fall of the Bastille, or the Roman Empire at its height.

We, the people, have reached a new low in cynicism and apathy. We need a change in leadership and a change in policy, both foreign and domestic, immediately, not next month or next year. Now. At the same time, our whole system of government needs a complete overhauling. We should put more businessmen at the head of the various departments, not someone's best friend or the man that contributed the most to his campaign fund. All the bureaus under the various departments should be cut to the bone. Why can't Hoover's report be brought to light again and some action taken to follow up his recommendations?

I have been a life-long Republican, but from the information that I derive from the newspapers and the radio commentators, I am afraid the numerous statesmen of the party are confusing the issue in Washington, but not the public. This is no time to play political ball when the future of the United States may be at stake. You know as well as I that if the population of this country was as unified as any foreign country composed of one nationality, conditions as they exist now would have probably been altered by force.

I hope, Senator, that you will not take any of the above as criticism of either yourself or your policies, as I believe the State is behind you completely.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD DAMELE.

NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU,
Reno, Nev., April 19, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We are forwarding a resolution of the Eureka County Farm Bureau to back the stand of the letter I wrote you regarding their grazing district recently.

The Nevada State Farm Bureau has no policy resolution regarding this grazing district. However, it is our primary function to support our county farm bureaus in any of their problems or programs.

Your attention and consideration to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU,
BILL HOWARD,
Executive Secretary.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Taylor grazing bill will handicap our livestock operations. Therefore, as a rancher, livestock raiser, and taxpayer, I do not want Taylor grazing.

FRED ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: I as a taxpayer, livestock owner, and user of public domain, feel that Taylor grazing would be detrimental to our sheep and cattle industries of central Nevada.

I am opposed to Taylor grazing.

MARY JEAN ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I would appreciate it ever so much if you could amend the Taylor Grazing Act, as I cannot see where it benefits anyone in this area as it is.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

FRED MINOLETH.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber, Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: As a lifetime resident of Nevada, and a stock raiser, I believe your plan of adjudication of the public-land remaining in this area is the only answer to a healthy livestock industry.

Sincerely,

M. M. HARCOURT.

EUREKA, NEV., April 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I as a taxpayer, livestock owner, and user of the public domain do not want Taylor grazing in central Nevada.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY W. ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV., April 16, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a livestock owner and rancher; have been in this business all my life with plenty of opportunity to observe conditions both inside and outside of the grazing districts. These grazing districts are a loss financially to the Government and to the stockmen. Outside livestock and ranges are in much better condition with less dissension and hard feelings between everyone concerned. The ranges themselves are mostly dust, rocks, and sagebrush. The Taylor Grazing Act is obsolete. The distance between a drink of water and a spear of grass is too great. Why can't they give the stock and stockmen a rest?

Sincerely,

MRS. TESSIE DAMELE.

PALISADE, NEV., April 16, 1951.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We do hope you will do everything in your power to keep Central Nevada out of Taylor Grazing and can adjudicate the range in the same way the water is adjudicated in Nevada.

Sincerely,

MARY BAILEY AND SONS.

EUREKA, NEV., April 11, 1951.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: In my utmost disapproval of the Taylor Grazing Act, I implore you to please make amendments to the act or abolish it.

As a stockman I can very readily see what an offset and a hindrance it is to this country.

Yours truly,

CHRIS ZUMWALT.

EUREKA, NEV., April 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

More Government control will ruin our livestock industry; therefore as a taxpayer rancher and livestock raiser I am opposed to the Taylor Grazing.

PIETRINA ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV., April 18, 1951.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
UNITED STATES SENATOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On April 9, at one of our livestock meetings, Mrs. Charles Daniels read us your telegram in regard to Layton grazing.

I congratulate you on your endless efforts to help us people in Nevada. If we had more fighting Senators like you, we would certainly be a lot better off.

I would like to explain my future in ranching as I see it now. If Layton grazing stays in effect and we are forced to reduce our herd and have to pay additional fees to run our stock, I will be forced out of business. At the present time I believe I am an asset to the State of Nevada and also the United States as I am self-employed, but under Layton grazing and Government supervision I will be a liability to the State of Nevada and the United States as I will have to be put on the unemployment list. I believe the above applies to many more like myself that are just starting in business.

This is a very small area to have fought so long and still fighting for their freedom. They realize that every and any business that is put under Government supervision is another step closer to losing the freedom that made the United States what it was years ago and still partially remains.

When our forefathers, in 1776, signed the Declaration of Independence they deposited to the account of every person in America, then and for all time, the greatest wealth in the world—freedom. Let us not now in 1951, or any other time in our lives, overdraw that account so that the coming generation will not be able to draw on that great wealth.

It is up to the fighting Senators like yourself to do so. God pray that you will and can find enough true American Senators to help you, because by yourself I realize it is a lost battle.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

FRED MINOLETH.

GRASS VALLEY RANCH,
Austin, Nev., March 29, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLY: Enclosed you will find a list of the livestock owners who signed the petition sent March 7 to the Secretary of the Interior. You will note that most of the substantial ranchers of central Nevada are represented, among them two members of advisory boards in adjacent grazing districts.

As well as this petition, hundreds of cards and letters were sent spontaneously to the Secretary of the Interior, sent by bankers, store owners, ranchers in neighboring grazing districts, all protesting the formation of the new district.

Resolutions protesting the formation of the new district were passed by the board of county commissioners in Nye, Lander, and Eureka Counties.

Gov. Charles Russell endorsed a petition signed by the directors of the Central Nevada Livestock Association and sent it to the Secretary of the Interior with the recommendation that grazing district 6 be not set up.

Both you and Congressman Baring have taken steps to prevent the formation of this new district in central Nevada. Senator McCarran is shrouded in silence. I don't know what he is doing.

If ever a community has tried to show that it is unanimously opposed to an unwarranted scheme of bureaucratic expansion, central Nevada has certainly done so. However, the Secretary of the Interior has brushed off petition, recommendation by the Governor of Nevada, letters, resolutions of county commissioners as what he poetically terms "some organized resistance."

In reply to my letter of March 7, I received—not from the Secretary of the Interior, himself but from an Assistant Secretary, Dale E. Doty—a letter which was a re-

hash of Clawson's letter to you. Clawson did not like your proposed bill, did he? But obviously he would not like anything which infringes on the power of the Bureau of Land Management.

With regard to the statement of the Bureau of Land Management that central Nevada is in urgent need for supervision of the use of the area * * * to prevent overgrazing and so on. There has been no range survey made by the Bureau of Land Management on which to base their statement that the land is being abused. To the best of my observation the range in central Nevada is in as good condition—and in some instances much better—than the range in adjacent grazing districts.

In Assistant Secretary Doty's letter to me and in a copy of a letter sent Baring by Chapman, there is reference made to the objections of central Nevada ranchers to paying the grazing fee. At no time have we objected to paying the fee. What we do object to is having the Bureau of Land Management so mismanage the range that after 15 years of their care a cut of 50 percent in livestock permits become necessary as it did last year in Elko County.

If, as the Department of Interior maintains, the grazing districts are such a success in Nevada districts 3 and 5, why do we—who hear the ranchers' story, have such a horror of being put in a district? Could it be that the success exists chiefly in the minds of the bureaucrats who administer these districts?

I am sorry I can't get up another petition to send you. It never entered my head to send you one in the first place because I knew that you fully understood the feeling against a district in central Nevada and were already doing what you could to prevent it being set up. But since the reception of our petition, etc., by Mr. Chapman, I can see we were wasting our time when we addressed our protests to him.

I and the rest of the central Nevada ranchers sincerely appreciate your efforts in our behalf. I feel sure that it is still possible to prevent the formation of this new district. Any suggestions you can give us will be gratefully received.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD MAGEE,
President, Central Nevada Stock-
men's Association.

FEBRUARY 19, 1951.

To the Honorable OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior:

We, the undersigned stockmen of central Nevada, do most earnestly petition that no further steps be taken to set up a Taylor grazing district in central Nevada at this time. We believe that due to the exceptionally low carrying capacity of the range lands involved, it would be impossible for the Bureau of Land Management to adjudicate and administer a Taylor grazing district except at serious financial loss. We feel that now, when every effort at domestic economy is being made, it would be most regrettable for any bureau of the Government to spend money on a venture which none of the people living in the area feel to be essential to the well-being of the land and the users thereof.

Since the inception of the Taylor Grazing Act, the overwhelming majority of central Nevada ranchers have been opposed to the establishment of a Taylor grazing district in central Nevada because they do not feel these particular range lands can best be administered in that way. They have made every effort to conserve the range they use. There have been no instances of range abuse in the area where it is now proposed to form a new Taylor grazing district. If there had

been such abuses, the formation of a Taylor grazing district might be understandable and its expense might be warranted. But what can possibly be gained by inflicting on central Nevada a Taylor grazing district that it does not want, that it does not need, and that will of necessity be run at a financial loss?

Petition to Chapman signed by the following livestock owners:

Richard Magee, Austin; William J. Streshley, Austin; Marie Streshley, Austin; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Carl, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. John Yelland, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain or Austin; Chester Perrine, Smokey Valley, Austin; J. E. Pardick, Smokey Valley, Austin; G. S. Moore, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Emma Rogers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Darrough Brothers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; B. W. Rogers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Dan Berg, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Carver, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Robert Cornell, Round Mountain; Gene Cornell, Round Mountain; O. Francisco, Round Mountain; Armando Francisco, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. Will J. Farrington, Round Mountain; Mrs. Charles McLeod, Smokey Valley, Austin; Frank Rogers, Smokey Valley, Austin; Peter Damele, Austin; Peter Jason Damele, Austin; Bernard G. Damele, Austin; Elizabeth Martin and son, Eureka; Bill Givens, Austin.

Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Peterson, Austin; Domingo Segura, Eureka; Dan Filippini, Beowawe (sold out since signing); Fritz Walti, Beowawe; William H. Walti, Beowawe; Emil A. Walti, Beowawe; Steve Allen, Beowawe; Clarence G. Allen, Beowawe; Mrs. Estella Allen, Beowawe; Emil Baumann, Beowawe; Walter E. Baumann, Beowawe; Ernest O. Baumann, Beowawe; Alma Woods, Austin; Fermin Espinal, Austin (partner of Bertrand Arambel); Adelaide Callaghan, Austin; A. F. Bordoli, Tonopah; Alma Fallini, Tonopah; R. A. Fallini, Tonopah; John Carter, Tonopah; Martha Bordoli, Tonopah; Virginia Fallini, Tonopah; E. W. Fallini, Tonopah; Mrs. E. W. Fallini, Tonopah; Helen Fallini, Tonopah; Joe B. Fallini, Tonopah; Edward P. Murphy, Tonopah (sold out since signing); C. J. Howard, Tonopah; June Howard, Tonopah.

Charlene Locke, Tonopah; Joe Clifford, Jr., Tonopah; Roy Clifford, Tonopah; Joe Clifford, Sr., Tonopah; Marguerite Boscovich, Tonopah; Bozo Boscovich, Tonopah; Mrs. Roy Clifford, Tonopah; Mrs. Joe Clifford, Sr., Tonopah; Mrs. Joe Clifford, Jr., Tonopah; Willis Walch, Adaven; Edna Walch, Adaven; Joe B. Fallini, Jr., Tonopah; Melvin J. Filippini, Tonopah; Emma Ornelas, Tonopah; Hamilton Ott, Round Mountain; Albert Hooper, Tonopah; Charles E. McLeod, Smokey Valley, Austin; Frank G. Arcularius, Tonopah; Bill Palmer, Tonopah (partner of Murphy; sold out); John Weeks, Reese River; Willie Bill, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Henick Smith, Reese River; Wickson Charly, Reese River; Casey Birchim, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Emmett Rasse, Reese River; Mrs. Lucy Pete, Reese River; Mr. Jim Frank, Reese River; Archie Hooper, Reese River.

Joe O'Toole, Austin; Bart O'Toole, Austin; Duman Hooper, Reese River; Mabel Jackson, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Gene Boots, Reese River; Mr. James Babbis, Reese River; Mr. Carl Dyer, Reese River; George O'Toole, Austin; Arthur O'Toole, Austin; Irene Hayden, Austin; Laurence O'Toole, Austin; Alice O'Toole, Austin; Grover Pardee, Austin; Roy L. McCann, Reese River; David A. Stevens, Tonopah; John D. Callaghan, Austin; Roy A. Brown, Austin; Charles D. Keough, Tonopah; W. W. Whitaker, Fallon; A. D. Drum, Jr., Fallon; Jim Daniels, Goldfield; Chris Dahlstrom, Goldfield; Chas. Cecchisi, Gold-

field; Claire Borgerson, Gold Point; Rudenick, Bozarth & Tayler, Lida; Oasis Ranch, Inc., Oasis; E. Seminario, Dyer.

G. L. Morris, Austin (sold out his share in Kingston since signing); St. John Laborde, Austin; Bill Gondolfo, Austin; James Hayden, Austin; W. D. and M. E. Caton, Austin; John Ansolabehere, Austin; Dolly Ruth Ansolabehere, Austin; Adam Welch, Battle Mountain; Ramon Ourbide, Battle Mountain; W. T. Jenkins Co. by Louise Marvel, president, Battle Mountain; Charley Welch, Battle Mountain; Henry Filippini, Battle Mountain; Mary Jean Etchegaray, Eureka; Leroy Etchegaray, Eureka; Bernard Damele, Eureka; Charles Damele, Eureka; Jos. Flynn, Eureka; Floyd Salgowski, Eureka; Mary R. Bailey & Sons, Eureka; Stephen Damele & Sons, Eureka; Mary Jean Ithurralde, Eureka; James Ithurralde, Eureka; John Iroz, Eureka; J. M. Rabalaeti, Eureka; Raymond Labarry, Jr., Eureka; Raymond Labarry, Sr., Eureka; Mary Jean Labarry, Eureka.

Louie Goyhonette, Eureka; James Hunter & Son, Eureka; Reinhold Sadler, Eureka; Floyd Sadler, Eureka; Ted M. Thompson, Eureka; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka; Mrs. Emma Schaefer, Eureka; Floyd Schaefer, Eureka; A. C. Florio, Eureka; Fred Minoletti, Eureka; M. M. Harcourt, Eureka; Chris Zumwalt, Eureka; Fred Etchegaray, Eureka; John Jay Casey, Tonopah; Eleanor L. Titus, Tonopah; Eugene Lee Titus, Tonopah; Sarah Locke, Tonopah; Leroy Sharp, Tonopah; Ellen Sharp, Tonopah; James G. Sharp, Tonopah; Lina Sharp, Tonopah; Emery Garrett, Curran; Marlon E. Locke, Tonopah; Madison L. Locke, Tonopah; H. L. Titus, Tonopah; John Titus, Tonopah; Shirley, Chiatovich & Humphrey, Silver Peak; W. M. Chiatovich, Silver Peak; Carroll L. Humphrey, Tonopah; Allen H. Roberts, Round Mountain; Wm. Walter, Tonopah; Milton Russell, Tonopah and Fallon.

NYALA, NEV.,
April 7, 1950.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your efforts in the past in keeping us out of a grazing district, especially at our March 1 meeting.

What was the outcome of your meeting with Mr. Chapman? I am enclosing a clipping from the Tonopah meeting.

Anything you can do to stall or down this movement will be greatly appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

HOWARD N. SHARP.

(Clipping attached:)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PRESS FOR
TAYLOR GRAZING DISTRICT

Members of the Central Nevada Stockmen's Association have been notified by the Department of the Interior, Washington, through the Bureau of Land Management, stockmen occupying some 7,000,000 acres of unappropriated land, mostly desert, in central Nevada, will be organized into a Taylor grazing district—No. 6—within 90 days after March 1.

This is a followup to the adjourned meeting held in Tonopah Wednesday, March 1, 1950, at which time Government officials were primed to get the organization actually underway. Reading of a telegram received by the Eureka County Livestock Association from Senator GEORGE MALONE, stating that Secretary of the Interior Chapman would not press further action against the stockmen in forcing them to either organize a grazing district or accept lease provisions of section 15 of Taylor Grazing, without further conference with MALONE, served to bring about an immediate adjournment of the Tonopah meeting.

Meantime the central Nevada association is attempting to introduce through Senator PAT McCARRAN amendments to the Federal range code which, if adopted, would make it much easier on the stockman affected when and if district 6 is organized.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
March 2, 1950.

SENATOR GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: After attending the meeting in Tonopah yesterday, March 1, we think even less of a grazing district.

They said we could not count our ranch property and our wells, pipelines, and water developments as base property for priority in the district. It had to be one or the other.

They also said the public lands would be open for lease if we did not form a district yesterday.

MR. MALONE, could you get a bill through Congress to repeal section 15 of the Grazing Act if you cannot repeal the whole act or do away with the Bureau?

Respectfully,

Mrs. HOWARD SHARP.

FALLINI BROS.,
Twin Springs, Nev., March 2, 1950.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: We just attended a meeting in Tonopah March 1 in regard to the Taylor grazing district 6, which includes Eureka, Nye, Esmeralda, and Lander Counties. Now as you know the majority of the stock and land owners always voted out and still do. Thanks to your telegram, we did succeed to postpone the forming of district 6.

Mr. Greenslit was chairman. He stated that all the districts under him were self-supporting, but I still have my doubts about that.

Now anything that you can do to keep us out of the Taylor grazing district and section 15 (lease act) will be highly appreciated by all of us.

Personally I feel that it is a detriment to the stock raiser for several reasons: (1) You have that extra tax. (2) You cannot run your own business—they will tell you how many head to run on a certain time of year on a certain range. Now if a person has been in the business all his life, he is going to take care of his range better than a man that just comes in and tries to tell him how he should run it. (3) The way I understood Mr. Greenslit say, they would not recognize State water rights as priority holdings on the range. Now, I want to tell you this, that my brothers and I have spent several thousands of dollars in developing water, and improving the range. And we have been here all our lives. I think the tax sheets for several years will prove that we have been making a success of the business.

We do not raise much hay, and have to depend on the range, which most of the other stockmen do in this section. So if our water rights that have cost us several thousands of dollars are no good, we would have to quit the business. It would be impossible for our outfit to lease this range, and most of the others feel the same. The majority does not want either one of the acts.

If we still have a democracy, it looks to me like majority should rule. We have voted to stay out of the Taylor Grazing Act and also section 15 by a big majority at all times and still do.

We are members of the Central Nevada Livestock Association and the majority are opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act or sec-

tion 15. So anything that you can do to help us keep out will be highly appreciated.

Thanking you for past favors.

Sincerely,

E. W. FALLINI.

JIGGS, NEV., February 16, 1950.

SENATOR GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am aware from following your record that you have a pretty thorough knowledge of the existing conditions which are vital to the industries of Nevada, but thought I would write and give you my views on some of the things which I have been watching and perhaps might give you some new ideas of what we livestock producers of Nevada are up against.

From your recent addresses I know that you are on the right track when you advocate State control of range rights, as it stands to reason that individuals who are in this country and know the conditions could handle range problems better than under the remote-control system from Washington, D. C.

Many of us have spent a lifetime and all of our capital in building up a livestock outfit which is entirely dependent on the right to graze our stock on the public domain.

Under the Taylor Grazing and Forest Service we do not own our grazing rights although we have paid for them, and they constitute 75 percent of our capital investment.

I contend that these rights should be irrevocably tied to the livestock producer's property as they are the greater part of his capital investment, and I do not believe the Government should have a right to cancel or revoke his permit except under very drastic conditions, as cancellation of a permit is equivalent to confiscating his whole capital investment, as no livestock ranch in Nevada can operate without range and all of these millions of acres of so-called public domain are absolutely worthless to the State of Nevada or to the United States without the livestock producers making them valuable.

The State of Nevada is almost wholly dependent on the livestock industry for existence and this range problem is very vital to everyone living within the State.

We understand that supervision of range is necessary, but not confiscation.

Whenever the Government takes a grazing permit from a livestock producer it means confiscation of his ranch and whole capital investment, as the ranch property is absolutely worthless without range rights.

Anyone who has lived in Nevada knows that the State would fold up overnight if the livestock industry goes under.

Up to the present time the Government has not confiscated a person's capital investment, but under our present Socialist regime we cannot tell what to expect. I, for one, am sure that people of the United States will produce five times as much under the individual-enterprise system than they ever would under Socialist control.

We have a glaring example of what Socialists can do for a government when we observe the once powerful British Empire.

Another thing I would like to mention is grazing fees, which are supposed to go up or down following the livestock prices. When we sold beef last year we took from 30 to 35 percent lower prices than we received the previous season. However, the reduction of forest fees is set at 12½ percent. Why the discrepancy, and who has the right to set these fees? Evidently the range users have no say in the matter.

Well, Senator MALONE, our only hope of salvation lies in the integrity of our representatives in Washington, so I will close and

say: Long live the Republicans, and may they eventually come out on top, although I feel sorry for the party that tackles the almost impossible task of trying to bring order out of the chaos which the past 18 years has made of the United States Government.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. BRAY.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
January 20, 1950.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We are writing to you relative to the formation of the proposed grazing district in central Nevada. We are sure that we speak for the majority of the stockmen when we say that we do not wish to be included in any grazing district. If a district is organized it will be in opposition to the will of the people concerned.

A year ago we were told, at a meeting of the stockmen in Tonopah, that we must choose between going into a district or leasing. The majority of those present preferred the district to the lease, but it was understood that we did not choose either if we could remain as we have been under our State laws.

We are already operating at a disadvantage, and our margin of profit is very small. Much of the range land is of little or no value and our operations are scattered over a large area. This makes it difficult to patrol the range so our losses are heavy due to straying and from cattle rustlers. Then, too, our county tax rate is very high and any additional fees or taxes would be hard to meet. We wish to thank you for your help in the past, and any effort you can make in our behalf will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HARVEY L. TITUS.
ELEANOR TITUS.
EUGENE TITUS.
JOHN TITUS.
SARAH LOCKE.
MADISON LOCKE.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., January 18, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I heard your speech before the annual farm bureau meeting in Ely and was much in agreement with the ideas that you expressed there. You are on the right track and we want you to know that we stockmen out here are in agreement with you.

At our meeting of the Central Nevada Livestock Association the other day we decided to let the Bureau of Land Management make the first move because they have not molested us to date. But, that doesn't mean that we are for any form of supervision because we are not.

We feel that any help that you can give us in stalling this off will be greatly appreciated by all of our group.

Thanking you for your interest and with best wishes,

Yours very truly,

JOE WILLIAMS.

STONE CABIN RANCH.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah I wish to say that speaking for myself and our immediate neighbors and cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the

wide diversity of character of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example one area for a wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat while another area might be considered fourth-class sage brush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if your Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business.

We hope you will do all in your power to defeat passage of the act.

Respectfully yours,

JOE CLIFFORD, Jr.

EUREKA, NEV., January 3, 1950.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue the fight against Taylor Grazing Act and Government control of livestock men.

EUREKA COUNTY LIVESTOCK GROWERS,
Mrs. JUANITA DAMELE, Secretary.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
January 13, 1950.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Through your advice during your recent visit to Tonopah, I am writing to give you my feelings on the present Baring bill, as well as my feelings toward forming a Taylor grazing district in this area around Tonopah.

Since talking with you I have read the Baring bill, but I know that in reading it there was only a very small part of it which I could understand. However, I do think the Baring bill if it goes through, would enable the Department to set this entire area up as a district. So far as my part anything done that can at least detain the passing of this bill would be greatly appreciated, and I am certain you can realize the same attitude from at least 90 percent of the active ranchers using this area today.

As for the formation of a grazing district, I can say we are still very much against it. Under the present range code of a district it just does not seem possible it can work satisfactorily or efficiently in an area of this type where it takes so many acres to run one cow or a sheep, making it completely impossible to administer from the fees of the livestock using it. Also, there's the fact that this area is a desert area, and droughts, as you know, are not uncommon, which only causes flexibility in carrying capacities of these ranges. Each and every rancher in the area, to my best belief, have in the past, and are still developing, water wherever possible, and best suited to the range, but aside from this fact, we are all depending largely on snow for stock watering, and in a condition as this, our ranges have to be very flexible as to boundary lines, for in desert areas snowstorms are very spotty, and there are many occasions when you see stock from several neighboring outfits using one area where the snow happens to be.

We had a meeting of our association a short time ago, and rather than trying to give you the details in this, I'm sending a clipping from which you can get the scope of our thoughts. It seemed the majority thought it best to keep as quiet as we can since we have at one time told the Government we would form a district. Now if we started to fight back and change our minds, they would think now we didn't know what we wanted, but I can assure you when the time comes we will be fighting 95 percent against it.

I certainly wished you could have been here to our meeting, for you could have given an

awful lot to it, for I know I certainly gained from the talk you gave, and I'm looking forward to other meetings.

Sincerely,

FRANK G. ARCULARIS.

(Clipping attached:)

CATTLEMEN DECIDE TO LET INTERIOR DEPARTMENT MAKE FIRST MOVE ON GRAZING ACT

Among the resolutions adopted Saturday at the meeting of the Central Nevada Stockman's Association held in the Tonopah justice court, and attended by 60 stockmen from Nye, Esmeralda and Lander Counties, was one introduced by E. W. Fallini, Twin Springs, asking that the association post a reward of \$500 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of persons charged with "rustling" stock belonging to members. The resolution was passed and Secretary-Treasurer Joe Williams authorized to engage District Attorney William J. Crowell to draw up the necessary papers, bond, and attend to other matters necessary to make the offer legal and binding. In introducing his resolution, Fallini remarked he "understood there was considerable rustling going on at the present time."

VOTE TO LET "SLEEPING DOGS" LIE

After much debate and consideration of suggestions tendered by various members, concerning action of the Interior Department in forcing stockmen of Nye, Esmeralda, Eureka, and Lander Counties to either apply for formation of a Taylor grazing district, or accept leasing provisions of section 15 of the act, it was voted to let the matter rest as it is, leaving the issue to the Government, and for Government action. It was the consensus that any attempt to ask Nevada's Representatives in Congress to take this or that stand, on any angle of the issue involved, might logically result in decision of the Interior Department to move more or less precipitately, bringing the whole thing to a head now instead of later.

WILLINGNESS INDICATED

"We have not heard a word for over a year after we notified the Interior Department that, out of necessity, because of Department pressure, we are willing to have the Government proceed with formation of a Taylor grazing district in this area in preference to a general acceptance of leasing under provisions of section 15 of the act," President Dick Magee stated, "and I believe we will be better off if we just continue as we are, and make no move of any kind. In other words, it is strictly up to the Interior Department to show its hand now—not up to us."

Reason why the Interior Department has made no move toward processing the acreage involved is believed due to failure of Congress to appropriate adequate funds for administration purposes.

EUREKA COUNTY NOT REPRESENTED AT MEETING

There was no direct representation from Eureka County, where stockmen are fairly well organized under the title of Eureka County Stock Growers' Association, but a telegram was read from A. C. Florio, former Nye County stockman, and now president of the Eureka association, urging members of the central Nevada group to continue their fight against "usurpation of rights of the stockmen," an application fully expressing opinion of 100 percent of stockmen present at Saturday's meeting. Inasmuch as the Interior Department has threatened all stockmen using Nevada lands as yet unappropriated, now shrunk to approximately 10,000,000 acres, and all in the four counties mentioned here, with "range trespass" unless they either apply for leases, enter existing grazing districts, or organize one of their own, members voted at the meeting held here in December 1948 to accept as graciously as possible the Department's demand.

LEASING FAVORED

With exception of a small group of stockmen, chiefly centered in the Fish Lake valley areas of Esmeralda County, where it is declared advantageous to lease in preference to joining organization of a new grazing district, all stockmen present favored the latter alternative.

FALLINI BROS.,

Twin Springs, Nev., December 30, 1949.
Senator MALONE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that we, the people of Nye County, are in favor of the Taylor Grazing Act. I wish to state, as to my opinion, after having many conversations with most of the ranchers in Nye County, that 98 percent of these said ranchers are strictly opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act, and also the Lease Act.

We, the ranchers of this desert country, have had our heart and soul in our work, improving these ranges and have spent the most of our income improving the water holes, also sinking wells, erecting windmills, and gas pumps, also going to the expense of large storage tanks, troughs, and corrals.

The largest portion of this country is wasteland and we have had several droughts in the last 20 years, also a disastrous winter in 1948 and 1949, which killed a lot of our stock, on account of deep snows and extreme cold weather.

We were under the impression that our State water applications were sound enough for us to spend this money on improvements on this said range. If people didn't think the State applications of Nevada were sound, and that their ranges would be protected, I believe there would have been but very little improving done.

I feel that the red tape connected with the Taylor bill would affect our business in many ways and the extra tax would be disastrous. I also believe the Taylor bill would be a detriment to the Government, as I don't believe it would be self-supporting from fees taken in to administrate the program.

We hereby plead that you do all that is in your power to protect us.

Sincerely,

JOE B. FALLINI.
Mrs. J. B. FALLINI.

FALLINI BROS.,

Twin Springs, Nev., December 30, 1949.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter, asking you as a personal favor, to help us cattlemen in Nye County, Nev., keep out of the Taylor Grazing Act, and also the Lease Act.

We have plenty of taxes and expenses, and I don't think we need additional burdens and taxes.

I can say that 98 percent of the stockmen in Nye County do not want the Taylor Grazing Act or the Lease Act. We were told about a year ago, that we had only one alternative, the Taylor Grazing Act, or the Lease Act. Naturally we voted for the Taylor Act, as we could not pay the taxes on the Lease Act.

I can tell you and our other Representatives in Congress that we have enough burdens now, without Taylor Grazing and Lease Act.

I am speaking for myself, and, I think, 98 percent of the cattlemen in Nye County, Nev.
Sincerely,

RAYMOND A. FALLINI.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
December 26, 1949.

Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: I am making an attempt to tell you why I do not want the Taylor grazing.

First, it means more taxes on an overtaxed business.

Second, it means putting someone to supervise my business, that I have spent a lifetime in building up.

Third, the range has been developed to its fullest extent, so there could be no benefit there.

It all sums up to the facts, if we are left to continue like we are we can continue to operate. But if we have to pack a bigger load we won't be able to operate.

Yours respectfully,

H. N. SHARP.

STONE CABIN,
December 24, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our neighbor cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole.

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of characters of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada, and we feel that if Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business. We hope you will do all within your power to defeat passage of the act. The Clifford family is one of the oldest cattle raisers in the State of Nevada. I do believe the cattlemen have been hit hard enough last winter; my own loss was 35 percent.

With best regards to you and ever yours,
your old friend.

JOE CLIFFORD, Sr.

I have been in the cattle business for over 50 years.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., December 23, 1949,
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of characters of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush land or sagebrush grazing land, it simply can't be made to work out in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act the majority of cattle people will simply be forced out of business.

We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of the act.

Respectfully,

MELVIN J. FILIPPINI.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., December 22, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves, and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing

Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative; for example, one area for a very wide area, may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business. We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of the act.

Respectfully,

ELDON WALCH.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., December 22, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work out in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of cattle people will be simply forced out of business.

We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of this act.

Respectfully,

EMMA NAY WALCH.

GOLDFIELD, NEV.,
December 22, 1949.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regards to the Taylor Grazing Act or the leasing under section 15.

This is to tell you that I do not want either of them where I am ranging cattle in Nye and Esmeralda Counties and wish that you will do all in your power to prevent this part of the county from being put under either of the acts as 50 percent or more of my cattle range has had to be developed by drilling wells and cleaning springs before it could be used for cattle range, and with that expense on the development and maintenance of the range is all the business can afford; any additional expense of grazing fees would be the killing of the business. I am speaking from my whole life's experience in these two counties.

Yours respectfully,

JIM DANIELS.

STONE CABIN RANCH, NEV.,
December 19, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our neighbor cattle rancher, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole.

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land compiling the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area, very wide area, may not produce enough food to support a goat, while other areas might be considered sagebrush grazing land.

It simply cannot be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act or the leasing Act is forced upon us the majority of the cattle people will be simply forced out of business. We hope you will do all you can in your power to prevent this act.

Respectfully,

BOZO BOSEOVIAL.

STONE CABIN RANCH, NEV.,
December 19, 1949.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as whole.

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land compiling the public domain it could not be made operative. For example, one area, very wide area, may not produce enough food to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land.

It simply cannot be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business.

We hope you will do all in your power to defeat passage of the act.

Respectfully,

ROY CLIFFORD.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
October 6, 1949.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I have received your letter regarding the Baring bill, H. R. 2914. I am pleased to hear that no action has been taken on this bill to date, and I am certain that a majority of the ranchers in central Nevada feel the same way.

You inquired in your letter whether the ranchers expressed a wish to go into a district at the meeting held in Tonopah on last December 4. The vote taken was to determine whether we preferred leasing or forming a district. The majority voted for the latter, as there was some doubt as to how leasing would work out. I can assure you, however, that we prefer neither if it is possible to remain as we are.

Thanking you for the interest you have taken in this matter, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

HARVEY L. TITUS.

NO OTHER LANDS AFFECTED

MR. MALONE. Mr. President, let me say that the measure just introduced is supported by the interested organizations and individuals in the three counties concerned; and it would establish a precedent in dealing with range lands of small value within the public land area of the State of Nevada. No other State would be affected. As a matter of fact, no part of the State of Nevada not directly described in the detailed land description in the bill would be affected by it.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION TOO COSTLY

I believe this bill would constitute a step forward in dealing with public land. An investigation will show, Mr. President, that it is almost impossible to collect sufficient funds from the use of such

lands to pay for the cost of administration. Mr. President, generally speaking, more money is spent in supervision and for alleged improvements of the range than is collected for its use. This means a continuous drain on the Federal Treasury, a continuous expense to the other taxpayers of the Nation.

ADJUDICATION OF THE RANGE

The only time any range in the West is ever overgrazed is when those who use the range are unable to protect it from outsiders. In the measure which I have introduced it is proposed that there be an adjudication of the range, similar to that which is done by the engineers who adjudicate the use of the waters in the arid States. Under adjudication no one is entitled to take water from a person who has previously used the water. The use establishes "water rights."

Mr. President, in the measure I have introduced, I call for an adjudication of the range rights, in order to determine what use the present holders have been making of the range. If the range has been used by one person, under the provisions of this bill he will receive a permit for that use. If the range has been used by a community or group of persons, that will be determined, and the matter will be handled accordingly.

NO INTERRUPTION IN DEVELOPMENT

Under the provisions of the proposed legislation, the present users of the portion of the range which those users have been trying to develop for future use will be able to continue with their plans. No supervision will be necessary, for no one will deliberately ruin land which he is given the right to use. Those who favor the Taylor Grazing Act supervision still hark back to the old times when there was no adjudication of the range rights by the Government or State. In those days, in order for a person to protect his range, he had to make a dust bed out of it.

In 1914, I began to work on the ranges as surveyor and engineer for cattle and sheep outfits. I surveyed the range. The only way one could protect his rights was by means of script—soldier script, Indian script, and other script—and by the purchase of water holes and the buying out of anyone who could interfere with the use of the range.

The State of Nevada later passed a Stock Water Act. The State understood what was necessary in respect to regulation of the range. The act was passed while I was State engineer. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, supervision of the range to that extent came under my jurisdiction.

PRIOR RIGHTS—TRESPASSERS

That act provided that an application for a stock watering permit on a range which was substantially utilized could be rejected, by virtue of an existing right. The act made a trespasser out of anyone who grazed such lands without a water right. The State of Nevada was then well on its way toward the development of an adequate regulation of the range.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT OBJECTIONABLE TO PEOPLE WHO CAN HANDLE OWN BUSINESS

The Taylor Grazing Act was passed by Congress in 1934; and that act gave

the Secretary of the Interior or other Cabinet officers or lesser officials the right to tell the people of a range or grazing community what they must do in regard to the use of the range.

As will be noted from the letters and other communications which I have placed in the RECORD today, the people think they can handle their own business better. They do not need to have additional Government funds expended in their midst. They will not interfere with the use of the Federal lands for mining, agriculture, fish, wildlife, recreation, or any other purpose. They are simply interested in their established right to use the land for grazing.

SPECIAL CASE, NOT RELATED TO OTHER AREAS

Mr. President, it is time that the Congress reviewed that policy. This area of land is one on which there is very light rainfall and very little feed for livestock; in fact, on this land perhaps as little feed is produced as on any public lands in the United States. The land would, under the provisions of this bill, be handled as a special case.

Such handling of this area in south central Nevada would not affect any Government regulation of any other area; in fact, this proposed legislation would not affect any regulations concerning Indian reservations, forest reservations, parks, or official withdrawals for any other purpose.

If the plan operates as the junior Senator from Nevada thinks it will, the idea might spread, and that would be good; if it does not, he will be the first one to recommend repeal of the act.

The principle of public land development and use through the provisions of S. 2341, just introduced, is that the use of the range is an integral part, one of three factors, of the necessary livestock unit; and that such integrated use is the only way the arid public ranges can be converted into taxable property.

Such customarily adjudicated use could be lost by nonuse, and in no way would interfere with the conservation and development of such public lands for other purposes.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I wish at this time to refer briefly to an entirely different matter: the difficulty between the British and the Egyptians in the Suez Canal area. We note in today's dispatches that Egyptian tanks and artillery pulled back from the bristling British defense perimeter in the Suez Canal zone. A dispatch from London said the Egyptians retired after having received a polite warning from the British commander to stay out of the British-occupied area. However, the Egyptians made a new threat on paper to expel the British, and Moslem extremists demanded refuge against the British troops. The canal area was set off and placed on a war footing.

COLONIAL SLAVERY SYSTEM CENTERS IN ENGLISH TRADE

Mr. President, in connection with the address which the junior Senator from Nevada made 2 or 3 days ago about the situation in that area, I wish to call at-

tention to a dispatch dated October 11 of this year by Mr. George Sokolsky. He is a well-known columnist and a great historian, having had valuable experience throughout the world. Mr. Sokolsky says:

The colonization of Asia and Africa by European countries moved into stride as the steamship replaced the sailing vessel. Increased mobility, developing navies, and the rising industrialization of countries using steam-driven machinery (to which later was added electricity) gave Western Europe and subsequently the United States an advantage not only over primitive lands but even over formerly great countries such as China, India, Iran, Egypt, and to a degree, Russia.

Power lay in coal and its utilization.

Great Britain became in the nineteenth century the principal colonial and capitalistic power on earth, centering in London control over shipping, banking, and insurance. While Amsterdam and Paris competed with London, both were subordinated to it, and when the United States entered the market for international finance and commerce, New York and Boston also subordinated themselves to London.

Mr. President, Mr. Sokolsky goes on to say:

The British were sound entrepreneurs, but in all countries the natives regarded them unfavorably. The first actual expulsion of the British occurred on July 4, 1776, when, at Philadelphia, American colonials declared their intention of separating from the mother country. This tendency might have spread were it not for the Durham report concerning Canada (1839), which laid the basis for the dominion system.

Actually, this system strengthened British colonialism. While giving a large measure of independence to Anglo-Saxon areas, it became possible more freely to exploit the weak and backward countries.

Two wars and oil have destroyed Great Britain's advantage. The wars wasted Great Britain's accesses to and control of universal liquid capital; oil altered the relationship of geography to physical power. Oil not only has replaced coal as the major fuel of commerce and industry; it has altogether reorganized military force, making the airplane, the submarine, the tank, mobile artillery new and different factors in military control.

Whichever Nation is in possession of oil or has free access to oil, possesses power. Within Great Britain itself there is no oil. In the remaining British commonwealth, oil is not significant.

The point needs to be made in passing that two new factors enter this situation, electronics and atomic fission, which may even further lessen the power of the major empires in due course.

The principal petroleum-producing areas are the United States, the Middle East, and Venezuela. The following figures are for 1949:

Oil reserves: Middle East, 4,404,300,000 metric tons.
United States, 3,722,900,000.
Venezuela, 1,287,700,000.
Others, 1,165,100,000.

The total oil reserves for the entire world on January 1, 1949, were 10,580,000,000 metric tons. Although new reserves have been found since then, I prefer to use these checked and authoritative figures.

By the term "Middle East" is meant Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Oatar. The two largest reserves are in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. The known oil reserves referred to showed 35.19 percent for the United States and 41.63 percent for the Middle East.

This is the world's supply of oil.

XCVII—822

Mr. President, Mr. Sokolsky traces the history of power, and he points to atomic power as the coming power which will completely destroy all such domination. He points out that the oil-producing areas destroy the domination of the coal-producing countries. In line with that statement and the debate on the Senate floor 2 days ago, I would say it is time for the United States to stop, look, and listen when it comes to the point of making a decision as to whether to support the empire-minded nations in their domination of the so-called backward nations. Those colonial nations are not so backward as to prevent their having developed their oil-producing areas, and I would say again, the nations which have been dominated for 300 years are on the move.

There is no possibility that the United States will be able to hold for Britain, the Netherlands, France, and Belgium, the colonial nations of the world. The colonies are not going to stay put.

Mr. President, I continue the column, These Days, by George Sokolsky:

The reserves of Soviet Russia are not given. In the Soviet area there are fields in Baku and in Rumania. It is also known that there are fields in Chinese Turkestan. The dimensions, development and production of these fields are not reported. A figure of 34,000,000 metric tons of produced oil is given for Soviet Russia, which is very small.

From the standpoint of reserves, the Middle Eastern countries stand out as largest. Newly found reserves in those areas are reported to be very extensive.

In 1950 nearly all Middle Eastern fields were held as concessions by British and American oil companies or as partnerships between such companies and the governments.

The oldest of these concessionaries is the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which in 1933 succeeded to part of the holdings of William Knox d'Arcey to whom a concession was granted in 1901. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. is owned as follows: British Government, 52.5 percent; Burma Oil Co., 25 percent; individuals, 22.5 percent. The Iranian Government nets about 15 percent as royalties and taxes.

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. also owns 23.75 percent of the Iraq Petroleum Co., the other partners being the Shell group, Compagnie Française des Pétroles, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and C. S. Gulbenkian. Anglo-Iranian and Iraq Petroleum own a number of other companies in various parts of the Middle East.

There then is the principal seat of potential power for industrial, commercial, and military purposes.

The issues are:

1. Shall the British and American interests control and exploit these reserves?
2. Shall the native nations control and exploit them?
3. Will Soviet Russia conquer these countries by war or revolution in order to control and exploit them?

ARE WE TO HOLD STATUS QUO THROUGHOUT WORLD?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the October 18 issue of the New York Journal American, Mr. Sokolsky has another article starting with these words:

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson's 14 points and his advocacy of the League of Nations, the United States accepted, not without considerable internal opposition, the role of leadership in world affairs. What that meant in practical terms has been that the United

States has succeeded to what had been for at least two centuries Great Britain's place in international affairs.

In another part of the dispatch Mr. Sokolsky asks:

How deeply are we going into Egypt? Are we entering upon a police action in the Suez Canal? Will the British do it alone, or shall we step in, and what if the British go it alone and the Egyptians defeated * * * there is no telling what can happen in these nationalistic days when some men fight for powers and others fight for * * *

Is this Suez Canal just plain old-fashioned imperialism, or is it one of those United Nations resolutions to maintain everywhere the status quo of 1945?

I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that the President of the United States has said that we intend to hold the status quo of 1945. He has said that whenever anyone begins to move, there the American troops will be found. I want to warn the United States Senate that we may be heading into something that is not thoroughly understood, and that now is the time to study it.

Mr. President, I think it is time that the United States Congress take this situation in hand to determine where the administration is leading us and do something about it.

England says that it is protecting the Suez Canal. Now, let us analyze that. From whom is she protecting it? From whom are we protecting her? I suppose from Russia. That is the only nation we had in mind when we appropriated around \$100,000,000 in one year.

England cannot protect the Suez Canal from Russia. It would take the interference of the United States of America to protect that area. Britain could not protect the Suez Canal any more than Egypt could protect it.

ENGLAND IN EGYPT TO HOLD SUDAN AND NILE TRADE

Let us get at the bottom of the question and study it a little more. What are the British there for? They are there for one thing, of course, and that is to dominate the economy of Egypt and to keep control of the Sudan country and upper Nile.

If the United States must do the fighting and the financing anyway—I just pose this question—should we not do a little financing of Egypt and support Egypt's troops? Egypt has more than 100,000 troops ready to move into the area. They say that Britain has broken their treaty with them; that Britain was to furnish them with certain arms so that the troops would be ready to fight. They have paid for the arms and have not received them.

WHICH SIDE IN TRADE WAR DO WE TAKE, AND WHY?

Let us find out whom we are protecting, and why. If we are to help an empire-minded nation in its selfish, unfair, immoral farming of the Sudan country and interfere with the economics of another sovereign country, let us admit that fact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point the article by George E. Sokolsky, as it appeared in the October 18, 1951, issue of the New York Journal-American and other newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADER'S ROLE BRINGS UNITED STATES
TROUBLE ON MANY FRONTS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and his advocacy of the League of Nations, the United States accepted, not without considerable internal opposition, the role of leadership in world affairs. What that meant in practical terms has been that the United States succeeded to what had been for at least two centuries, Great Britain's place in international affairs.

There has been no evidence that any large element of the American people aspired to this role. At no time since the defeat of the Paris treaty in the Senate in 1920 has any kind of referendum been submitted to the American people over the role this country is to play in international relations. In no political campaign since Warren Harding was elected President has an issue of peace or war, of international leadership, of imperialism been submitted to the American people.

The grand-scale developments in this field, involving this Nation in war and in bloodshed, are the result of day-by-day administrative decisions and acts which face our people as faits accomplis.

There is no use speculating on what might have happened had Willkie or Dewey debated these questions or if Senator Vandenberg had not pursued the bipartisan foreign policy. The fact is that by agreement between Democratic and Republican leadership, the foreign policy of this country and the actual implementation of that policy have never been submitted to the American people. Nor has the entire truth concerning it been documented so that the people understand what has happened and what the cost has been.

We have been going back and forth over the China situation with a bitterness and recrimination that is now strictly personal and is likely to be a principal issue in the next Presidential campaign.

Yet, for most Americans that issue is not clear. Shall they believe Harold Stassen or Philip Jessup, Louis Budenz or Owen Lattimore? Are they to believe Gerard Swope about the Institute of Pacific Relations or the documents found in E. C. Carter's barn in Lee, Mass.? Is Joe McCarthy a liar or even crazy or is Dean Acheson hiding something that is itching to come out?

The public will have to know one day why they are struck with the Korean war. They will have to know why to date there have been 90,000 casualties in what was obviously an avertible war. No brilliant publicity planning can save the architects of that error.

But that is not all that will have to be understood. This role of leadership is becoming burdensome. Here we are involved in Iranian oil. What are we going to do in Iran? Are we going to force the Persians to capitulate to the British? Are we proposing to make those people hate us? Do we plan to drive them into Russia's arms? Are we trying to convince the entire Moslem world that the United States is their enemy?

What decision of the American people, in Congress assembled or at an election, has authorized anyone to give the Moslem world from Casablanca to Pakistan cause to hate the United States? It was apparently intended to include Iran in the Truman containment document, which somehow was watered down to Turkey and Greece. Why Turkey and not Iran? Why Greece and not Formosa?

How deeply are we going into Egypt? Are we entering upon a police action on the Suez Canal? Will the British do it alone or shall we step in too? And what if the British go it alone and the Egyptians defeat them?

After all, Israel beat the British and the Egyptians combined. There is no telling what can happen in these nationalistic days when some men fight for power and others for glory.

Is this Suez Canal just plain old-fashioned imperialism or is it one of those United Nations resolutions to maintain everywhere the status quo of 1945?

What happens if Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Yemen and even distant Pakistan get into this quarrel between Islam and Britain, are we not involuntarily involved under the North Atlantic Pact? Should not NATO act, with Eisenhower, at the head of a European army consisting of American troops?

Leadership is not just words and speeches; it involves fighting, constant, interminable war. Leadership has brought to our shore the permanent war. We worry about Joe Stalin, but that is only one front. What of the Islam front? The Indian front? The Indo-Chinese front? The Philippines front?

It is a big world and nobody loves the leader.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on October 19, Mr. Sokolsky wrote another very significant article. It would be informative if those who do not have time to read history would take a short look at what he has to say. If we question what he says it might be well to inquire into it.

ENGLAND FATTENS OFF OF COLONIES

It is a very enlightening dispatch. It is George Sokolsky's article of October 19, 1951, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald and other newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have it appear in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

If the Moslems succeed in forcing Great Britain out of the Middle East, little of importance will be left to the Empire but the self-governing dominions. To Disraeli, India, was the richest jewel in Victoria's crown—and when India was lost, the Empire moved on its march of death.

From Elizabeth to Victoria, the British buildied an amazing world out of sea power. They pushed Spain and Holland aside, defeated France and combining military zeal with commercial skill brought the continents together by ships and goods and the movement of men and money. Truthfully, it could be said that the sun never set on the Union Jack or for that matter on British trade.

It was England's German King George III, and his stupid ministers who lost the Thirteen American Colonies. Such British statesmen as Burke and Pitt understood the error in their day and fought hard against the King's and Lord North's lack of statesmanship. The United States of America came into being, but the northern colonies, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and other areas taken from France, eventually became Canada and remained loyal.

British policy in Europe and Asia had ever been to permit no power to overwhelm either continent. In the balance of power, Great Britain played the middleman's role and profitably survived most wars.

However, the balance of power could not maintain the peace of Europe as long as the pressures of nationalism burst forth like geysers. British policy has generally been to discourage nationalism such as Joan of Arc or the French revolution or the Germany of Bismarck produced. Even the Italy of Mazzini frightened the British, as did, in time,

the Italy of Mussolini. If only the world would stay put, the British could always keep open the avenues of commerce.

But the world would not stay put and always so-called weak and backward nations pressed their claims upon the strong and decaying powers. The Crimean War saved Turkey from an emerging Russia but it did not save Turkey from its own decay, just as all the agreements and treaties defining colonial spheres of influence in Asia and Africa staved off war in the first decade of the twentieth century but not in the second decade nor in the third and fourth.

It is Moslem nationalism which now faces Britain in Egypt, Iran, Iraq, and, it is to be assumed, everywhere in Asia as far as Pakistan. It is not only that the Moslems feel the growing pains of resurrected nationalism, but as a practical matter, it no longer pays to be tied in with British policy or British trade.

Since World War I, what remained of the Turkish Empire in the Middle East was carved up among the great Moslem families into Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Jordan. Persia was changed into Iran; Palestine became Israel; Syria and Lebanon became sovereign; forgotten Yemen emerged. And oil made the Moslems rich, richer than they had been in all their history since Mohammed went on the hejira from Mecca to Medina.

Egypt is the heart of the Moslem world. It is historically the oldest existent nation in the human story. It is rich because of the Nile and the Suez Canal. It is rich because the British rescued it from the Osmanli, from the Turkish Empire.

The stakes are enormous, not only for Egypt, but also for Soviet Russia. The dangers are now greatest for the United States that has assumed the responsibility of maintaining the status quo of 1945, which means that the nationalistic impulses of such countries as Egypt, Iran, Iraq, India, Pakistan or any other nation are to be restrained in the interest of Great Britain.

But the Moslem world does not want to be restrained. It is on the march from Pakistan to North Africa. It is a world that can no longer be ignored. It has the will to establish itself as the third great power—the United States, Soviet Russia, and Islam. A powerful nationalistic leaven moves all of Asia—east Asia and west Asia, from the Pacific to the Mediterranean. Not Russia, Britain or America will stop this movement.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Lincoln said that if this Nation was ever destroyed it would be not from without, but from within.

TRICKS NOT SEPARATE; PART OF PATTERN

For 18 years, the taxpayers of this Nation have assumed that each piece of legislation proposed by the administration was a separate unit to be considered on its own individual merits. The taxpayers may not have liked it in any case, but each act taken by itself might have been assimilated without great harm to the country, and, notwithstanding the fact that common sense told them it was wrong, they have continually accepted such legislation through suffering rather than approval. This acceptance was due largely to the fact that the weavers of the pattern were clever enough to arrange certain benefits as bait for various groups of citizens.

What the public, and the Congress, apparently did not see was the pattern of a plot which is eating the heart out of our economic system: First, through the recognition of Communist Russia in 1934, without any safeguards whatever; second, through the removal of the metal base for our money system in 1934, laying

the groundwork for unlimited spending; third, through the application of the so-called reciprocal trade, dividing our markets with the nations of the world; fourth, through deficit financing, resulting in inflated printing-press money almost without limit; fifth, through the sending of billions to foreign nations, on the Karl Marx principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

As the pieces of the mosaic fall into place, the pattern of a "one economic world," planned by the theorists of all nations, including our own, should be plain to the citizens of this Nation, and should frighten them into action.

OUR DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICIES

We need a new administration with no vested rights in past mistakes—an administration which can shed from the Federal Government payroll the leeches and the hangers-on that have accumulated over the past 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in Government; an administration that will not tolerate disloyalty, either from ignorance or deliberate intent; an administration that will again place loyalty and integrity at the top of the list of qualifications for office.

It is time the American Government adopted American policies which will insure our security and continued well-being as a nation.

PRESENT STATE OF THE UNION

What is the effect of our present foreign policy? What is the effect of our present domestic policy? How did we get this way? What possessed a thrifty and intelligent people to sit idly by and watch an administration filled with improvident individuals and business failure dissipate our assets and divide our markets and our wealth with the nations of the world?

Here is the state of the Union under domestic and foreign policies which have lead us through a Second World War—and for what? For the privilege of spending untold millions, the greatest sum of money of all time, to prepare for world war III?

WISHFUL THINKING AND ALICE-IN-WONDERLAND THEORIES

For 18 long years, people have bowed to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories: The theory that deficit financing is sound economy, that the more we owe the greater our wealth; the theory of reciprocal trade, the principle that the more goods we can import from foreign sweatshop labor, the more jobs we create in America; the theory that taxes must be continually raised to siphon off any increase in wages and in business capital to prevent inflation.

NATIONAL DEBT—NATIONAL ASSETS

Our national debt is in excess of \$256,000,000,000. In 38 of the 48 States the States' per capita share of the national debt is greater than the assessed value of its property.

The administration and the Congress of the United States, in a few short years, have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

DISCARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The political "one worlders" are now ready for a fateful step to modify the Constitution so that the United States may join an Atlantic federation of nations. In such federation, each nation being equal, the foreign nations, without the formality of submitting such proposal to the Congress of the United States, could tax us for their support by the simple expedient of basing taxation on ability to pay, just as Russia is now proposing for the United Nations.

INFLATION

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada condemns the inflation achieved by the removal of the metal (gold) base for our money, deficit financing, the sale of almost unbelievable amounts of Government bonds, all resulting in a disastrous flow of newly printed money into the market. It is utter idiocy to say that inflation can be stopped by fixing prices on goods and services at the consumer level without determining the cost of such goods and services.

BONUS TO FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS—FOREIGN GIFT LOANS—TAXES

Granting a bonus to foreign manufacturers, through what the Democrats like to call "reciprocal trade," foreign gift-loans and other economic sleight-of-hand tricks, will work just so long as the American taxpayers are able and willing to pick up the check.

We do this by paying increased taxes, by purchasing additional Government bonds with savings, and by paying higher prices for the necessities of life.

Mr. President, the people doing the work in this Nation will pay the taxes, even down to the \$40 a week stenographer. She will find about \$8 deducted each week for taxes to support these sleight-of-hand performances.

ONE-HALF OF OUR PEOPLE'S SAVINGS, INSURANCE, AND WAGES STOLEN

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all of the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people. The administration admits that the purchasing power of the 1939 dollar is now 53 cents.

One difference between an individual and a sovereign government is that the individual is finished with his unbusinesslike practices when his bank quits him, while a government is not finished with its impractical schemes until the money it prints has no value or the public votes it out of office.

THE FOREIGN NATION "DOLLAR SHORTAGE" HOAX

The "dollar shortage" theory as an excuse for gift loans to foreign nations is the greatest hoax ever sold to a trusting public. Any nation fixing a fictitious dollar value on its own currency, demanding more dollars for its currency than it is worth in the markets of the world, will certainly be short of dollars.

The manipulation of the exchange value of their money by foreign nations is a common practice for trade advantage and is a form of piracy.

A FORWARD-LOOKING PROGRAM

An American domestic and foreign economic policy, which will insure this Na-

tion's security and continued well-being, must be adopted while our country is still solvent. Only by such a program can we continue to set an example for weaker nations to follow. Such a program should include the following steps:

THE DOMESTIC POLICY

First. Establish in this country a market for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, protecting our workers and investors against unfair competition of foreign low-wage producers. There is no issue of high or low tariff or import fee, but the proposition of a flexible import fee to make up the differential between the wage standards here and abroad.

Second. Make the Western Hemisphere self-sufficient for any emergency; encourage production particularly of strategic and critical materials throughout the Western Hemisphere, including South America, Canada, and Alaska; thus in time of emergency, the Western Hemisphere could be made self-sufficient, and the transportation lines kept open.

Third. Establish a sound currency: Determine the degree and extent of the current inflation, and fix the price of gold to conform—establishing a gold standard. The price of silver should be tied to the price of gold as a standard, inasmuch as approximately half the people of the world have used silver for money for the past 2,000 years.

Fourth. Regain for the Congress its power as one of the three independent branches of the Government set up by the Constitution. Congress must resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce, regulate money, and approve treaties and agreements with foreign nations. Many of these constitutional duties of the Congress have been taken over or modified by the executive branch during the last 18 years.

Fifth. Return to the States all rights of regulation and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States. Many such rights have been exercised by the Federal Government through congressional inertia or actual legislative acts during the past 15 years.

THE FOREIGN POLICY

First. End the ruinous administration policy of showering foreign nations with gift-loans of money taken out of the pockets of American taxpayers to make up the phony "dollar shortage." Accept reasonable amounts of foreign currency at the current rate of exchange, for the purchase of goods and services in this country, and then use such currency in the purchase of goods in the respective foreign countries.

Second. As a condition of such relationship, require a free exchange of the currencies of foreign nations between themselves, and in terms of the dollar upon the New York and London exchanges.

Third. As a further condition, require that foreign nations protect the integrity of private investments in their respective countries.

Fourth. As a further condition, require that there be established equal

access to the markets of those areas which we are committed to defend, providing that any nation may protect its own workers and investors through tariffs or import fees, but that no third nation may fix quotas, money exchanges, or other subterfuges to preclude the United States from trading with that nation upon an equal basis.

Fifth. Extend the 128-year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas in Asia and Europe that is necessary for us currently to defend for our own security and well-being.

THE ESTABLISHED FOREIGN POLICY OF OTHER NATIONS

It must be recognized that the foreign policies of the nations of Europe and Asia are based upon the principle voiced by one of England's great Prime Ministers, Lord Palmerston, in 1858, when he said that—

We (the English) have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.

Mr. President, we have a current example of the English adhering to those principles.

This foreign policy was reiterated by another great Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in 1945, when President Roosevelt's suggestion that England relinquish her claim to Hong Kong was answered with a statement which was heard around the world:

I did not become the King's Prime Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

That was saying in another way that their interests, and not their friendships, are permanent.

We also must acknowledge and protect our permanent interests. This is a sound principle, which we have not followed. No sovereign nation has a right to sacrifice the interests of its people. Congress has shown very little indication of understanding where our ultimate interests lie.

DISCLAIMER

SWEATSHOP LABOR COMPETITION

I oppose the administration's bonuses to foreign manufacturers, the so-called "reciprocal trade" policy, which puts the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the workers and investors of this Nation, thus threatening the American high standard of living.

INFLATED CURRENCY

I oppose the administration's inflated currency policies, which started in 1934, with the cutting loose of our money system from the metal—gold—base, and is aggravated by the sale of additional Government bonds to cover continuous deficit financing, resulting from the unnecessary sending of billions of dollars to foreign nations and the vast amount otherwise wasted by the administration.

Between \$50,000,000,000 and \$30,000,000,000 was supposed to have been spent on the military between VJ-Day and the outbreak of the great police action in Korea, and we had nothing to show for this huge sum.

The administration and the Congress of the United States should treat the taxpayers' money in the same manner

that the cashier of a bank treats depositors' money, as a trust to be fully accounted for to the people who furnish the money.

RUINOUS TAXATION

I oppose the policy of the administration of raising taxes to siphon off raises in wages and investment profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation. I favor taxation for necessary revenue only.

FOREIGN DOMINATION

I warn against the domination of our economy and our foreign policy by the Fabian-Marxist school of thought which we have been following. This one-economic-world philosophy has led to gift loans of billions of our taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations, to make up their balance of trade deficits each year, and threatens to level our standard of living with those of other nations of the world.

We have inadvertently adopted the Socialist policy between nations which Marx enunciated more than 100 years ago for application within a nation when he said, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

CONCLUSION

This Nation needs a dose of common horse sense and old-time religion.

We need an administration which will reestablish the integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two newspaper articles, which appeared in the October 16, 1951, issue of the Reno Evening Gazette and in other papers.

There being no objection, the news articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED INTEGRITY IN GOVERNMENT, REPUBLICANS TOLD—DESIRE FOR POLICY TO BRING SECURITY VOICED BY MALONE

"We need an administration which will reestablish integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad," Senator GEORGE W. MALONE Monday told a Western States Republican conference in Seattle.

And the well-attended meeting of national committeemen and other Republican leaders from the West heard another Nevada voice a demand for a change in party policy to lure the country's big labor vote.

POLICY FOR LABOR

"We're going to have a set policy for labor," said Harold Stocker, of Las Vegas, chairman of the Nevada State central committee.

He told a meeting of State chairmen that he thought the workingman has had a justifiable case against the Republican Party.

But Edward Ingle, of Washington, D. C., head of the GOP radio and speakers bureau, reported the job of appealing to the labor vote may be sizable.

He said that the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor in San Francisco was told that the A. F. of L.'s political action committee needed \$9,000,000 for its

purge drive against Republican and some Democratic Congressmen.

The labor issue came up after delegates attending a meeting of national committeemen from the West gave a standing ovation to Guy G. Gabrielson, national committee chairman.

Gabrielson's resignation has been demanded by some Republicans in connection with a loan to his firm from the Reconstruction Finance Corp.

PRAISE CHAIRMAN

"There is not one member of the national committee who does not stand in praise and enthusiasm of Mr. Gabrielson," said Harlan I. Peyton, of Spokane, national committeeman from Washington State.

In a prepared speech, Senator HERMAN WELKER (Republican, Idaho) declared that "never in the history of America has a national administration been so utterly saturated with crime, corruption, communism, and confusion."

Senator MALONE told the conferees that we need a new administration with no vested interests in its past mistakes, one which can shed from the Federal payroll the leeches and hangers-on that have accumulated over the last 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in government.

It is time, he said, that the American Government adopted American foreign and domestic policies which will insure our security and continued well-being as a nation.

Charging that for 18 long years people have listened to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories, MALONE cited the national debt in excess of \$256,000,000,000 and said that the administration and the Congress in a few short years have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people, he charged. He said he was opposed to the policy of raising taxes to siphon off wage raises and investment profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation.

"This Nation," he concluded, "desperately needs a liberal dose of common horse sense and old time religion."

REPUBLICAN MEETING CONSIDERS BOYCOTT

SEATTLE, October 16.—Republicans today considered demands for a Government boycott of cheap-labor foreign goods and a protest against concealed attempts by the United Nations to govern American fisheries.

These proposals and others with a western tang were placed before an 11-State Republican regional conference called to work out vote-getting strategy for the 1952 elections.

The resolutions committee, headed by George Hansen, of Salt Lake City, recommended that the party's national platform—

Advocate excluding foreign products of underpaid labor where it hurts American workmen and farmers;

Strongly deplore concealed attempts by the United Nations to exercise sovereignty over our fisheries and further manipulating them for political purposes;

Oppose the valley authority method of river-basin development because it would put almost unlimited powers in the hands of appointive officials;

Favor United States return to the gold standard;

Support immediate statehood for Hawaii and allowing Alaskans to elect the Territorial Governor, now appointed by Washington.

Conference delegates turned to the resolution after a heavy round of speechmaking themed to why the Democrats should be kicked out of office—and how.

NOMINATION OF ROGER M. FOLEY TO BE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in a special meeting today the Senate Committee on Finance unanimously approved the nomination of Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy. I ask unanimous consent to report the nomination, and I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of Roger M. Foley to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATIONS RELATING TO PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR PSYCHOSES

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar a few days ago House bill 320, a bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service was passed unanimously. Shortly thereafter the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

I have discussed the subject with the distinguished Senator from Illinois today. He is unable to be in the city. He says that while he still feels that the bill should not have passed he will not ask for any further delay in the consideration of his motion to reconsider.

On that basis, Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration and denial of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Senator from Oklahoma has talked with the Senator from Illinois, and that the Senator from Illinois has no objection to the motion being brought up.

Mr. KERR. I have talked with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator make his request in the form of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KERR. I am making it in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I understood the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I submit my request in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the motion to reconsider?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think we ought to have in the Record a very brief explanation of what the bill does.

Mr. KERR. I shall be very glad to give the distinguished Senator an explanation.

The House passed a bill which created a presumption of service connection for any psychosis which developed with reference to World War II veterans for a period of 3 years following separation from the service.

The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill so as to limit the presumption in favor of the veterans for 2 years, and then limited the benefit to priority for entrance into a veterans' hospital and for out-patient treatment.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with reference to H. R. 320, which a member of his staff has given to me, be inserted in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I regret exceedingly that I must continue my objection to H. R. 320, which provides a presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 2 years from the date of separation from active service, as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Present laws and regulations provide for a 1-year presumptive period after separation for most chronic diseases, including psychoses. The question at issue here is, Shall the Congress extend a blanket presumption of service connection to cover all cases of psychoses developing within 2 years (in the case of the Senate bill) or 3 years (in the House version of the bill) or shall the Veterans' Administration be permitted to judge each individual case on the basis of its complete medical history, as required by law, in order to determine service connection?

I believe it should be the latter. I base that belief on the following statement of the Veterans' Administration, contained in its letter to the Finance Committee, which appears on pages 2 to 4 of the Finance Committee report:

"Psychoses may result from any one of a number of factors such as an inherent or hereditary defect. There is nothing in the circumstances of military service in time of war which creates a presumption of fact that a delayed manifestation of a psychosis some time after discharge is in any way related to the fact or circumstances of service. If circumstances of service so conflicted with the mental make-up of the individual as to cause a psychosis, they would have done so at that time and not many months or years after service. However, because of the difficulty of determining the exact cause of a psychosis, it would rarely be possible to secure affirmative evidence to rebut the presumption of service connection proposed by the bill."

I should like to point out, parenthetically, that while the Senate committee report, on page 1, in the explanation of the bill, states that the bill, as reported by the committee, provides for a rebuttable presumption of service connection. However, the language of the bill itself which appears on line 10 of page 2, omits the phrase "in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary" contained in the House version of the bill, and merely provides that psychoses developing within 2 years of separation shall be deemed to be service-connected. That is, the presumption is not a rebuttable one—it is an absolute presumption.

I would like to emphasize that there is nothing either in law or in regulation to preclude the Veterans' Administration finding a service-connection if a thorough examination, by skilled medical authorities, of all available evidence furnished by lay as well as by medical authorities, indicates that such a service-connection is warranted.

Not only is such a possibility not precluded—it is actually encouraged both by statutory declaration and by the regulations of the Veterans' Administration. I should like to call attention to the provisions of Public Law 361 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 20, 1941. That law requires (1) that in considering the question of service connection, "due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of his service as shown by his service record, the official history of each organization in which he served, his medical records, and all pertinent medical and lay evidence"; and (2) that the Veterans' Administration "shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of such veteran: Provided that service connection of such injury or disease may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary. The reasons for granting or denying service connection in each case shall be recorded in full."

In other words, that law, as well as pertinent Veterans' Administration regulations, which repeat substantially the same language, give the veteran the benefit of any doubt, and actually seem to place the burden of proof on the Veterans' Administration. Yet they do allow the VA to examine each case individually, on its merits, as determined by a thorough study of all the information. The bill H. R. 320 forbids such an individual case-by-case examination, and provides for a blanket presumption.

Now it may be that in actual practice, despite these laws and regulations, the Veterans' Administration does in fact refuse to consider any psychoses developing after the 1-year period as service connected. If this is the case, then the practices of the VA should be corrected by administrative direction stimulated, if necessary, by congressional prodding. But I do not believe it should be corrected by extending the presumptive period, in the absence of medical foundation therefor.

One final point: The bill as reported by the Finance Committee restricts the benefits derived from a determination of service-connection to priority with respect to hospitalization. I should like to point out that, if my own State of Illinois is any example, the Veterans' Administration hospitals are completely filled, as to their neuropsychiatric wards, and many service-connected psychotics are now in State hospitals. There are also a great number of non-service-connected veterans psychosis cases in these public hospitals.

The effect of this bill would not be to move any additional service-connected psychosis cases into VA hospitals, since these are filled. What it means, essentially, is that a great many non-service-connected psychosis cases who are now in State hospitals at State expense would remain in these hospitals, at Federal expense.

I should also like to point out that the reason that many VA hospitals are filled to capacity is that there are great numbers of non-service-connected cases in those VA hospitals, who entered when there were not sufficient service-connected cases to fill all the beds, and who apparently cannot be removed but in any case are not being removed from VA hospitals, to make way for the service-connected cases still in State hospitals.

Figures substantiating this are to be found on page 147 of the Veterans' Administration Report for 1950. During the fiscal year 1950, there were 45,503 psychotic

patients in VA hospitals. Of these only 21,875 were service-connected while 23,628, or over 50 percent, were non-service-connected cases. In "other Government and private hospitals," on the other hand, there were 1,317 psychotic patients, of which 329 were service-connected and 831 non-service-connected. I ask that a table showing these figures be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I believe that we are setting a dangerous precedent in this bill, by extending, without sound medical foundation, the presumptive period for a chronic disease, the VA hospital facilities for which are already filled to capacity, if the State of Illinois is any example. So what we may really be doing, by this bill, is require, without any individual examination, that the Federal Government pick up the check for many veterans who are already hospitalized at State expense.

VA patients remaining in VA and non-VA hospitals, June 30, 1950, from tables 8, p. 147, Annual Report of Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1950

	Psychotic patients only		Other Government and private hospitals
	VA hospitals	Other Federal hospitals	
All patients.....	45,525	926	1,711
Veterans.....	45,503	926	1,706
Service-connected.....	21,875	461	1,317
Non-service-connected.....	23,628	465	389
Others.....	0	0	0
Nonveterans.....	22	0	5
World War II.....	18,841	570	1,242
Service-connected.....	12,316	269	1,021
Non-service-connected.....	6,525	301	221
Others.....	0	0	0
World War I.....	23,280	308	452
Service-connected.....	7,662	161	287
Non-service-connected.....	15,618	147	165
Others.....	0	0	0
Spanish-American War.....	919	15	4
Service-connected.....	24	2	1
Non-service-connected.....	895	13	3
Others.....	0	0	0

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that either the motion be rejected or that I be permitted to move that it lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn. That disposes of the matter.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. With regard to the action taken concerning the bill referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma, H. R. 320, providing for a presumption of service connection for any psychosis, I am not sure that the Record in its present state will be sufficiently clear so that technical objection may not be raised to the action which the Senate took with reference to it.

Therefore, I make this parliamentary inquiry to the Presiding Officer. Is my understanding correct that the Record now stands that the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider was in effect withdrawn by proxy through the Senator from Okla-

homa, which then leaves the Record in the situation where the bill automatically passes and goes to the White House?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was informed that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was withdrawing the motion to reconsider, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. However, the Chair has since been informed that the Senator from Oklahoma did not have authority from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to withdraw the motion in his name. Therefore, the Senate will have to vote on the motion to reconsider. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois is perfectly willing that the Senate vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma tried to make it clear that he did not have authority from the Senator from Illinois to withdraw the motion to reconsider, but that in conversation the Senator from Illinois had stated that he would not object to the Senate's considering his motion to reconsider, and therefore the Senator from Oklahoma asked unanimous consent that the motion be considered and rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed by the Senate.

The motion to reconsider was rejected.

MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 351, providing that the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the nominations of 48 postmasters which have been acted upon by the full committee.

I may say that only 9 members of the committee are present in the city, but 12 members have agreed to report them favorably. I ask for the immediate consideration of the nominations. They have been reported in regular order, and no Senator from any State has opposed any of them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see p. 13752 House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1951.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to point out, as we approach the end of the session, that the three appropriation bills which are coming before us today in the form of conference reports, and the other appropriation bills which have been passed for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress appropriate a total of \$97,696,326,891.

This amount was exceeded only by the second session, Seventy-seventh Congress, in 1942, when there was appropriated \$147,000,000,000. In the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1943, there was appropriated \$114,000,000,000. Both of those, of course, were in the World War II period and represented war budgets.

These figures are compared with \$61,200,000,000 appropriated during the last session of Congress, the previous peacetime high.

They are compared also with \$35,700,000,000 appropriated by the first session of the Eightieth Congress, which was the postwar law.

This record total includes \$6,000,000,000 in permanent appropriations, for interest payments on the public debt, and similar items. It excludes permanent appropriations for trust funds, which are not charges against revenue, and it also excludes the \$817,000,000 carry-over for foreign aid and the \$550,000,000 authority to use excess equipment for foreign aid.

The total is 4¾ billion dollars below the President's requests for these appropriations.

The total is made up as follows:

Fiscal year 1951, supplemental, \$6,808,581,632; fiscal year 1952, regular, \$71,582,962,024; fiscal year 1952, supplemental, including foreign aid, \$13,217,948,060; and fiscal year 1952, permanent, \$6,068,835,175. The grand total is \$97,696,326,891.

The budget requests of the President totaled \$102,380,301,185.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can get an early vote on the report. Every Senator knows the facts about the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee asks for a vote, may I ask the Senator from Michigan whether the figures which he has given include also carry-overs and unexpended sums.

Mr. FERGUSON. These are only appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. They are new appropriations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; new appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. New appropriations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the total?

Mr. FERGUSON. \$9,696,326,891; it is a staggering figure.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make one comment, and ultimately the country will understand it, although perhaps not now: Human nature being what it is, unless there is strict economy on the part of government, we cannot avoid all sorts of criminal abuses in the administration of governmental affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that statement made by the Senator from Georgia, following my remarks, because I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, is very familiar with what is going on and where we are going.

I brought this matter to the floor today because I believe that as we near the end of the session, and after many Senators have voted on issues of economy, all of us should be mindful of where this appropriating process will lead us. The words "billions of dollars" mean very little to the people; but when we say that the billions of dollars which are appropriated by the Congress and are spent by the executive agencies are only the result of the collection of taxes from the people themselves, the people begin to understand the meaning of the words used to describe the extremely large appropriations and expenditures. In short, Mr. President, Congress acts as trustee for the taxes which are collected, which later are made available to the executive branch of the Government for expenditure. Inasmuch as we in Congress are acting as trustees for the people in connection with the collection of the taxes, I believe Congress has the duty of calling to the attention of the people, as well as the duty of considering very seriously itself, the fact that the appropriations already have amounted to more than \$97,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan have a breakdown of that amount, to show how much of it is for national-defense purposes?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not have that before me.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was asked a very pertinent question by the majority leader as to the amounts of appropriations for de-

fense. I have obtained further figures from the Appropriations Committee and I should like to make a statement to become a part of my remarks at that point. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a part of my previous remarks.

The regular defense bill was \$56,900,000,000; public works for the military were \$4,000,000,000; mutual security was \$7,300,000,000; the fourth supplemental appropriation for 1951 is \$6,400,000,000. These make a total of \$74,600,000,000 out of the total of \$96,696,326,891. These are the appropriations for national defense, rounded off, which the distinguished majority leader had previously requested me to furnish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement of the Senator will be printed as a part of his original remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan have a breakdown to show how much of that amount will be spent during the present fiscal year?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not. Expenditures data, of course, is obtainable only from the executive departments, and what I have been giving is the sum of congressional authorizations for expenditure.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think I can help the Senator from Michigan in regard to that matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait a minute. I shall yield a little later.

Mr. President, the annual budget message of the President estimated 57.3 percent of appropriations for fiscal 1952 would be spent in the fiscal year. The salient fact is that the Government is not able to spend the money as fast as Congress appropriates it, and is not able to spend the money even as fast as they anticipate that it will be appropriated.

The appropriation figures I have given will not show up in the deficit for this particular year, and I know the Senator from Georgia had in mind the fact that these figures will show up at some time in the very near future.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President; and if the Senator from Michigan will allow me to make a little more explicit what I mean—

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Then let me say that I mean exactly this, and nothing less, that the wanton waste of public funds is corruption itself; and we cannot prevent corruption in government when reckless expenditures of public moneys, such as we are witnessing now, are taking place.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has just said is certainly a profound truism, because as we treat the dollars, so will those who spend the dollars treat them. If we treat lightly the dollars we appropriate, those who spend the dollars will, also, treat them lightly, to the point of corruption.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I simply wish to say that, in fairness, I think the amount

referred to should be broken down. Later I shall endeavor to place in the Record a breakdown of that amount.

Mr. President, I do not think we should label with the word "corruption" the appropriations which Congress makes for the purpose of the national defense. To the contrary, I think such appropriations are most necessary.

In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which already has been reached, I shall place in the Record a statement of just what the Congress has done in order to preserve our democracy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What difference does it make whether the money is spent this year or next year? The money has been appropriated, and it will be spent.

We may talk about national defense and leadership; but I wish to state that the test of good leadership is whether it results in keeping the people of the country out of trouble, instead of getting them into trouble.

During the past 20 years my observation has been that we have had one emergency after another; our leadership has gotten us into that trouble, and then has asked the Congress to make huge appropriations to help bail out the administration.

The test of good leadership is whether it is able to keep the people out of trouble, rather than get the people into trouble.

All this huge amount of money has been appropriated, and much of it has been spent, and all of it will be spent. It makes no difference, really, whether the money is spent this year or next year, or whether it is spent for war purposes or for other purposes. The fact is that it will be spent. The sums which Congress has appropriated, and which have been spent or which will be spent, are amazing in amount. If this process is not stopped, it will bankrupt the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is altogether true and I want to add a further point. The 97 billion dollars to which I have referred, even if not all of it is spent this year, will help to build up and make all the hotter the fires of inflation which will consume the savings, the insurance, and even the property of the people of this country. All will go up in flames of inflation, because every dollar that is appropriated will be spent, and to that extent just that much more will be taken away from the civilians, in the form of consumers' goods.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has referred to the expenditures for purposes of national defense. The Senator from Michigan and I are on the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. One thing which we must develop at all times is a greater cost consciousness on the part of those who are responsible for the defense

establishments. We know that approximately \$70,000,000 of the expenditures will be made for the armed services, which, in my opinion, are not yet nearly as cost conscious as they should be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. What he has said is entirely true.

Let me refer to one example: The Signal Corps of the United States Army desired to have an office building in the city of Philadelphia. That was last year. They did not request of the Congress specific appropriations for the purpose of permitting the purchase of the office building. They had the choice of acquiring one of two buildings. One building could have been occupied within approximately 30 days, as shown by the record. However, instead of acquiring that building, at a lower cost, the Signal Corps, because of political pressure—and the record shows this—bought the Penn Athletic Club Building, and transferred funds for that purpose, and then notified the two Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and finally the Appropriations Committees, that they were going to transfer those funds in order to buy that building.

The Signal Corps estimated that the cost of repairing the building would be either \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000, in order to put the building into proper condition for occupancy. They said that could be done within 90 days.

In the last appropriation bill the facts are disclosed, namely, that instead of being able to occupy the building within 90 days, 10 months now have passed. They do not have the entire building, though they have now spent \$2,100,000 more than the estimate. Think of it, Mr. President—instead of its costing \$1,500,000, it is costing \$2,100,000 more than that. So the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts may well say that there is not the consciousness.

Where are they going to get this \$2,100,000? Are they going to come to this Congress to disclose that it cost them that much more? No, they are going to take it from a fund for operation and maintenance. By no stretch of the imagination should any agency be permitted to take permanent capital expenditures out of funds for building maintenance and operation. I call it to the attention of the Senate now because it shows the excessive amounts we are appropriating for maintenance and operation, when it is possible for them to remove \$2,100,000 from those funds and apply it to permanent capital structures. So the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and all those Senators who serve upon this committee know that more care and more attention must be given to these appropriations.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must have a board of civilians who will sit down impartially to figure out not only the amount of money which we can afford to spend, but to determine whether this money should be spent, whether we should take a building such as the Penn Athletic Building, and how much it will actually cost for a real sur-

vey, instead of merely taking these figures as if they did not amount to anything, knowing they could come back to the Congress to obtain an increase. We need a real board and a real physical examination of all these problems. This Congress needs a budget officer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. Congress needs a budget officer. It needs as many employees as there are in the Office of the Director of the Budget, who is now under the control of the White House. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks, and I join with him in what he is saying. I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows that there is on the calendar a bill to create a joint budget committee of the Congress and to staff it, and to keep them on duty 12 months of the year, every day in the year, to do the very job the Senator says we need to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am well aware of it. I have long been in favor of such a bill. I have been cosponsor of a similar bill. Incidentally, the bill to which the Senator refers contains a proposal which the Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have been advocating for a number of years, and which will be a significant advance if we can get it enacted. The original proposal was that before any bill is passed by the Congress there should be attached to the report an estimate as to the cost of operation under that bill for the ensuing period of 5 years. That is the bill to which the Senator refers, as I have mentioned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That provision is in the bill. It does not come from the Budget Director, but it is to come from this committee after it has made a study of it, and after it has collaborated with the Director of the Budget and others to present to the Congress an estimate of what it is going to cost in a period of operation of 5 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is the only way we are going to have control of the budget. This afternoon we are going to pass three bills making supplemental appropriations. Before the signature of the President is even on the original appropriation bill, before we get it out of committee, there are already started what are known as deficiency appropriations, new appropriations. It is contended in connection with practically all of them that they are submitted because it is necessary for them to cover the legislation which we are passing daily. The fact is that when we pass legislation here we do not have positive knowledge of what it is going to cost in the future for the operation of the legislation we pass. We will never get real economy in Government until we begin to pay attention to the fiscal consequences of the legislation we pass.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say to my distinguished senior colleague that I am delighted to hear his support of the McClellan bill. I would point out to him that the majority leader this afternoon agreed to have that bill considered early in the next session. I am counting on the Senator's support. We of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are counting on his support to help push it through the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it has my support. I have been working for its purposes for years. Mr. President, our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been on his feet while I have been making these remarks—and I am sorry that I have taken so long, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. President, is another person who appreciates that this is an enormous job. Within the past few days he has appointed a subcommittee, or he will do so within the next few days, a subcommittee which will be authorized to make what we call field investigations as to how we can effectively curtail appropriations. We hope that he may become chairman of that subcommittee, and that it will cover not only the domestic but also the foreign field in the matter of field investigations, in order that we may keep in closer touch with these appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to obtain the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, these bills have been discussed time and again. I refer to the two bills which are now coming up. They have priority. I am perfectly willing to answer any questions which any Senator may wish to ask, but I ask that action be taken on the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report on the bill, H. R. 5684, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 5684, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pp. 13755-13758, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1951.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5215, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101 to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for 'Administering the public debt,' \$500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to pay for time and space for advertising the savings-bond program by press, radio, or television."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 under this head for acquisition of land may be used for purchase in the name of the United States in trust 20 acres of land in Placer County, Calif., for the use of the Indians of Auburn Rancheria."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line 4 of said amendment after the word "countries" insert: "(not exceeding 450)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "*Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available to the Commission for personal services is hereby amended to read, 'of which not to exceed \$30,400,000 shall be available for personal services'; *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, of 1952, shall not be applicable to the Commission."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting \$1,100,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for loans pursuant to section 14 of the act, is hereby decreased to \$600,000, and the limitation fixed in Public Law 137

granting \$4,375,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for the expenses of transporting to the United States displaced persons of German ethnic origin, is hereby decreased to \$3,400,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert: "\$31,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert: "\$1,100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of \$5,450,000 named in said amendment, insert: "\$5,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line two of said amendment, change the section number to "Sec. 1001."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line one of said amendment, change the section number to "Sec. 1310."; and before the period in the last line of subsection (d), insert: "; and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods"; and strike out all of proposed subsection (e).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line one of said amendment, change the section number to "Sec. 1315."; and in the last sentence of subsection (a) insert before the period: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation or distribution of technical, scientific, or research publications, the reporting or dissemination of the results of research or investigations, the publishing of information or other work required by law to carry out the duties of such Department or Agency other than work intended for press, radio and television services, and popular publications"; and before the period in the last line of said amendment, insert: "; nor shall any such provision in this or any other Act limit appropriations which may be used to compensate persons in the Office of Defense Mobilization who are engaged in informing the public about the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program, or persons in the agencies assigned functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, who are engaged in informing consumers, agriculture, business and labor, about rules, regulations, and orders, issued by such agencies under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 73, 87, 105, and 110.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that the third and last conference report on an appropriation bill is on its way to the Senate, so I shall

resume my seat and yield to my friend from West Virginia, who wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, verbosity, unlimited and intolerable, is ruthlessly scourging the United States Senate, wasting legislative time, squandering the taxpayers' money, provoking the ridicule of the Nation and impairing the reputation of the greatest lawmaking body in the world.

It has been written that in the sixty-fourth year of the Christian era the nefarious Nero, the last of the Caesars, fiddled while Rome burned. Since the fiddle was not invented until hundreds of years after this monster committed suicide, he must have possessed a miraculous artifice for wasting time, whether with or without musical accompaniment, as devastating as that which the Senate has distressingly demonstrated by talking tediously and tastelessly for more than 9 months, while communistic fires burned with fervent heat not only in Rome, but all over the world. During this unparalleled burning the faces of countless millions of fearful men and women have grown pallid in the ghastly light of the awful conflagration.

This Congress should have redeemed all the pledges contained in the 1948 Democratic platform, properly discharged all its other first-session duties and adjourned, sine die, as required by statute, not later than the last day of July. But in the evening twilight of the twentieth day of October we are still here, lingering, loitering, and chattering in willful defiance of the law and in flagrant violation of the commandment:

Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.

And why did we not complete our legislative task in the 7 months wisely allotted to us for that desirable consummation? What unfriendly fate thwarted our prudent purpose to render unlimited service to humanity in its hour of greatest need and danger? What malevolent thief robbed us of our lofty will to work while opportunity's sun was still high and bright in heaven? What calamitous visitation, fate or destiny for 290 days enfeebled all things senatorial except senatorial tongues? Hamlet adequately answered all these questions when, to an inquiry made by the garrulous Polonius, he replied, "Words, words, words." Thus the distracted Dane concisely voiced the spirit of Pope's admonitory lines:

Words are like leaves, and where
they most abound
Much fruit of sense beneath is
rarely found.

Hamlet also anticipated the semblance of Cowper's lament:

Our wasted oil unprofitably burns
Like funeral lamps in old sepulchral urns.

If an explanation of this answer were sought, it would probably be found in the fact that three or four Senators on each side of the political dividing aisle are apparently blood relatives of the Pilgrim's Progress character, named Talkative, the son of Saywell, who lived

in Prating Row. It should be remembered that this Talkative wasted his time just as we have wasted ours during the last 9 months and 17 days.

And how talkative has the Senate been? Please lend me your eyes and ears while I answer by illustration as well as argumentation. Attention is invited to the mountainous pile of books on the desk before me. It is composed entirely of the numerous volumes of the record of what the Congress has said and done since the 3d day of last January. This precious heap of books which weighs a hundred pounds is an authentic, modern imitation of the ancient Tower of Babel, from which the pestiferous affliction known as the confusion of tongues descended upon a defenseless, dumbfounded, and bedeviled world.

Now please behold this Winston red letter, long primer type Holy Bible. It weighs 2 pounds and 10 ounces. The tower composed of the records made by confused tongues weighs more than 38 times as much as this Holy Book.

The Bible contains, among many other things, the story of the creation of the whole vast universe, including everything, from the tiniest grain of sand to the most stupendous star. It also contains the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, which together constitute the only complete, perfect and imperishable law ever written for the government of mankind. This revered book is the repository of the sublime Psalms of David, the priceless Proverbs of Solomon, "Isaiah's wild seraphic fire," the glad tidings of the resurrection of the dead, and the blessings of life everlasting, in the palaces of Paradise, where happiness never ends, friends never part and loved ones never say good-by. All these holy things and too many more to mention here are fully described in the 1,149 pages of the Bible. But senatorial speeches and observations made during the present session of the Congress fill 7,920 pages of the RECORD—more than six times the number of pages the Bible contains.

The all-wise Creator, with only 773,692 words, in the Bible, tells the people of all time and place all that it is necessary for them to know in order to achieve unending prosperity, peace and happiness on this narrow bank and shoal of time and unending bliss in eternity's boundless domain.

With the reminder that there are 773,692 words in the Bible, the best purchasable hat in Washington is now offered as a reward to any Member of this body who will arise and guess within a million of the number of words Senators have officially uttered in this Chamber since the third day of last January. Depressing silence and monitory immobility indicate that no one purposes to hazard the making of a ridiculous conjecture. Therefore, fortify yourselves against the shock of the startling announcement that the expression of senatorial irrelevancy, loquacity, and verbosity since the third day of last January has required the astronomical total of 11,780,000 words—more than 15 times the number utilized in making the

greatest book ever written and telling the greatest story ever told.

The Bible contains 3,566,480 letters. The best purchasable television set in Washington will be given as a reward to any Senator who will guess within 5,000,000 of the number of letters contained in the words that Senators have uttered on this floor during the last 9 months and 17 days. Ominous silence and the obvious lack of a volunteer to demonstrate his guessing intelligence quotient admonish me to tell the Senate and the world that the stupendous, stunning, staggering number of these letters is 58,125,000—more than 16 times the number used in the Bible to describe the glory of God and proclaim His everlasting omniscience, love and law.

On the average, each Senator has consumed 78 pages of the RECORD during the present session of Congress. But more than a majority of the Senators should be congratulated upon the fact that their consumption of RECORD pages during the session has been far below this average. A third of the Members should be severally cited for having consumed fewer than 16 pages, while a half a dozen have earned the lasting gratitude of the taxpayers by heroically resisting temptation, during the entire session, and economically using fewer than 10 pages of the RECORD to express their views.

With hope for the benefit assured by the maxim, "Open confession is good for the soul," let me, with unfeigned embarrassment publicly confess that I have consumed 15 $\frac{1}{3}$ pages of the RECORD during the last 290 days.

The consumption of more than a hundred pages of the RECORD is chargeable to each of three Republican and three Democratic Senators. Without mentioning names, the Senate is informed that one distinguished Republican Member has completely filled 184 pages of the RECORD with his remarks. Other material that he has inserted has filled 125 pages more, making his total consumption of the RECORD 309 pages. It is a matter of common knowledge that the vocal organs of a small number of Democratic Senators have been not only overstrained but completely robbed of rest ever since this session began. The most voluble of our distinguished Democrats has, during this session, filled 132 pages of the RECORD with his talk, the greater part of which has been in behalf of the thrilling, imaginary consummation known as economy. This Senator has, with remarks and insertions, consumed a total of 159 pages.

The cost of printing the RECORD is \$85 a page. The average cost for each Senator to date is \$6,638.50.

The total cost of the recordation of all senatorial speeches, verbirosities and irrelevancies during the present session is \$646,272.

The cost to the taxpayers of the 309 pages used by the most talkative Republican Senator is \$26,265. The cost of the 159 pages consumed by the most talkative Democratic senatorial crusader for economy is \$13,515.

Consistency, thou fascinating jewel of sophisticated humbuggery, loquacity, and confusion, cease, oh cease to lead

illustrious, irrepressible windbags astray by the blinding and bewildering light of thy "alluring ray."

It would be interesting to hear from one of the few who have been the longest in preaching economy and the shortest in practicing it how much he thinks the \$646,272 collection of verbosity contained in this monumental mosaic of records from the realm of confused tongues is really worth. In my opinion, the world's champion auctioneer could not sell the entire colossal conglomeration for a hundred-thousandth part of its cost—or, in round numbers, six dollars—no cents.

It is an unpleasant but obvious truth that our waste of time in the making of the roaring redundancies and the raging insipidities contained in these RECORDS is exclusively responsible for our having been chained here since the last day of July as inescapably as poor Prometheus was bound to the rock.

But for our irrepressible prattle all the Senate committees, except the four most overburdened ones, could have completed all their important work and the Senate could have finally disposed of it before the first day of June. Could our constant chatter have been suppressed the four excepted committees, namely those on Finance, Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations, under the able and skillful leadership of their eminent chairmen, Senators GEORGE, McKELLAR, RUSSELL, and CONNALLY, respectively, could have completed all their arduous tasks long before the 31st of July—the day on which the Congress should have adjourned as required by law.

Upon the famous Semitic trial of the world-old issue, "if a man die shall he live again," Zophar, upon cross-examination, impatiently asked the afflicted Job, who had spoken approximately 2,500 words, the important question, "Should a man full of talk be justified?" The answer to this inquiry, made first by Job's friends, and later by the Almighty, was, in substance, an unconditional, emphatic "No." If we could call Zophar from the echoless shore to speak to us, as the Witch of Endor called Samuel from the dead to speak to the regal Saul, we should urge the critical Naamathite to express his opinion of a few unnamed Senators, each of whom has spoken on this floor more than a quarter of a million words during this session. The printing of the remarks of each of these Senators has cost the taxpayers more than \$10,000; an average of more than \$1,000 a month; more than \$33 every day since the third of last January—the date on which this session began. It may be safely assumed that Zophar, while delivering his opinion, would be constantly encouraged by loud and frequent shouts of approval such as,

Lay on, Macduff,
"And damn'd be him that first cries,
"Hold, enough!"

The few, but preeminently active, honorable windbags of the Senate, who unduly love the sound of their own voice, should be mindful of the tragic fate of Narcissus. He became so infatuated with

his image, reflected by a pool of water, that he loved himself to death.

Not only history, but mythology, with its captivating comedies and awesome tragedies, might repeat itself in this unromantic age and even in this unromantic Chamber. Excessive love of voice, like excessive love of self, might become disastrous. It might eventually allure a few Senators into talking themselves to death. Let us hope that our honorable, verbose Members will, by prompt reformation, deliver themselves from the peril of ignoble extinction, and their colleagues from the hazards of having to mourn untimely deaths, lower the Senate flag to half staff, and wear crepe on their sleeves.

To the credit of the Senate, a large majority of its Members have not abused their privilege of free speech or their constitutional right to talk their colleagues or the visitors in the galleries to sleep. A large majority of the Senators, with whom I am happy to be included, would not, in any conceivable circumstances, favor the slightest restriction on legitimate commendation, criticism, discussion or debate. But nevertheless it is high time for the innocent majority, cooperatively and vigorously, to endeavor to find some appropriate way to protect themselves against the daily libels in the press and comic strips, and the hourly slanders in hotel lobbies and on the streets to the effect that all United States Senators are "blow-hards," gashouses, "hot-air artists," "windbags," "twaddlers," and "blatherskites," regardless of the fact that fewer than 10 of the 96 Members of this great legislative body are guilty of these disparaging verbosity charges and loquacity insinuations.

If the wearisome few are suffering from undelivered speeches, imprisoned in their capacious brains or breasts, which they purpose to liberate here next January, we earnestly entreat them to spare us, and relieve themselves by delivering these accumulated masterpieces of platitudinous prolixity, profundity and ponderosity during the approaching vacation in highly secluded places, "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife" where the only auditors will be hoot owls, turkey buzzards and shitepokes. These, when vexed, as they certainly would be, could take the wings of the morning, noon or night and fly far, far away.

The Senate has too long endured the scourge of notorious verbosity. This hydra-headed, saber-toothed, insatiate monster has for many years been progressively gnawing the Senate's reputation. It has devoured the Senate's time, abused its patience and obstructed its progress. At last,

The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe, for change; Then let it come: I have no dread of what Is called for by the instinct of mankind.

Surely the instinct of the American people calls for the eradication of the Senate's unequalled verbosity.

Anyone who will invent, discover, formulate or find a solution of the problem of ridding this body of the nuisance and nonsense of irrelevant, useless talk will thereby earn the gratitude of the Nation

and deserve the erection in his honor of "storied urns and animated busts" more imposing and beautiful than any ever raised in country churchyards by loving hearts or lavish hands.

Let us, in the following well-known quotations, find encouragement to undertake promptly and energetically the difficult task of healing the Senate of its distressing, chronic mouth disease:

In all labor there is profit, but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury.

As empty vessels make the loudest sound, so they that have the least wit are the greatest babblers.

The habit of common and continuous speech is a symptom of mental deficiency.

The less a man thinks, the more he talks.

They always talk who never think.

He that hath knowledge spareth his words.

Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise.

A fool's voice is known by a multitude of words.

A fool's mouth is his destruction.

Mr. President, if it be true that a word to the wise is sufficient, sagacious Senators will heed these quoted warning words and in the future shun the broad, crooked highways of wasteful verbosity, loquacity, irrelevancy and confusion, and walk in the straight and narrow paths of economical usefulness, terseness, propriety and peace.

Let us firmly resolve that during the next session of the Congress we will vigorously strive, with the weapons of common sense, to lay the senatorial Tower of Babel as low as the walls of Jericho after the Levites had blown their trumpets against them.

In a great Shakespearean tragedy we learn that the Tribune Flavius, in rebuking the commoners for rejoicing in Caesar's triumph, said:

Go, go, good countrymen, and, for this fault, Assemble all the poor men of your sort; Draw them to Tiber banks and weep your tears

Into the channel, till the lowest stream Do kiss the most exalted shores of all.

We urge those who, during the present session, have most extravagantly wasted senatorial time and the taxpayers' money by persistently talking when the Senate should have been working to go to Potomac's banks and weep their penitential tears into the channel till its lowest stream do also kiss the most exalted shore of all. And let these exclusive proprietors of prattle, after having thus purged themselves of their vocal transgressions and verbal sins, return here on the eighth day of next January and diligently help to write upon the future's snow-white pages patriotic, humanitarian accomplishments so outstanding and beneficent that they will shame the past, glorify the present, and richly bless mankind till

The trumpet of the Lord shall sound, and time shall be no more.

Henceforth let us habitually do noble senatorial deeds instead of idly talking all day long, and thus

Make life, death and that vast forever One grand sweet song.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 19, and 25 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 26, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pp. 13762-13763, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5650, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 19, and 25 to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Not to exceed \$2,000,000 of the appropriation in this chapter for defense community facilities and services shall be available to the Office of Education for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools in critical defense

housing areas pursuant to section 10 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, and for providing school facilities and making grants pursuant to title III of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5411, Eighty-second Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "\$2,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in lines 9 and 10 of said amendment insert: "\$1,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 604. No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL.

The Chair laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 4255) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters and supervisory officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, passed by the House of Representatives on September 20, 1951.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since the Senate has passed a bill on this subject, and it has been already enacted into law, House bill 4255 should be indefinitely postponed, and I so move.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO FORMER SENATOR RANDELL, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 230) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends to the Honorable Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana, who served as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1899 to 1913 and as a Member of the Senate from 1913 to 1931, its cordial greeting on the occasion of his 93d birthday, which occurred on October 7, 1951, and expresses its admiration and gratitude for his long and devoted service to his country.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to Senator Ransdell at his home at Lake Providence, La.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 7, former Senator Joseph E. Ransdell celebrated his ninety-third birthday in his home town at Lake Providence, La.

He enjoys good health. He is still active. His mind seems undiminished in vigor.

He served Louisiana with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. His service in the House, from December 1899 to March 1913, included 12 years on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee; his service in the Senate from March 4, 1913, to March 4, 1931, included 18 years on the Senate Commerce Committee where he was particularly active in all matters relating to flood control.

He presided over the Rivers and Harbors Congress for 14 years, after having been active in its organization in January 1906; he authored the act of 1906 to eradicate Texas fever in cattle; the act of 1917 to create a national home for lepers—located at Carville, La.; the act of 1917—Ransdell-Humphreys bill; the first direct Federal appropriation for flood prevention; and the act of 1930 to establish in Washington the National Institute of Health.

He took a prominent part in the passage of the omnibus flood-control act of 1928, the culmination of nearly 30 years of diligent effort toward the prevention of floods and the improvement of rivers and harbors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses of Con-

gress adjourn on Saturday, October 20, 1951, they stand adjourned sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution providing that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 479) informing the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed to join a similar committee of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Resolution 479, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I move that the Vice President appoint a committee of two Members of the Senate, to join a similar committee appointed on the part of the House, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some further communication to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 171, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 20, 1951, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 172, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Rep-

representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after the sine die adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD FOR RADIO AND TELEVISION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, it is only because of the great urgency of the matter to which I am about to refer and because time is running out that I ask for recognition at this hour. I shall not take more than ten or twelve minutes. I think it is important to speak on this subject before Congress adjourns, because I know that many Members of the Senate are going to hear a great deal about it when they go back to their respective States. I am sure that some of my colleagues have already received letters from radio-station operators and owners in their States on the subject to which I shall address myself. It is because of this situation that I feel impelled to make a brief statement to the Senate prior to adjournment.

It is about six months since I first called the attention of the Senate to the great potential capacity of television to serve the public interest. Six months ago we had just seen a dramatic demonstration of this potential capacity during the hearings of the Kefauver committee. Indeed, it was my conversation with the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who served on that committee, which prompted me first to speak to the Senate on that subject. The junior Senator from Wyoming joined me in submitting a resolution calling for a Senate study of the vastly exciting possibilities opened up by television for adult education, for school use, and for the civil life of our Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the gavel pounding. This is a most important subject, and I would appreciate the attention of my colleagues.

I pointed out when the resolution was offered that, with the imminent unfreezing of nearly two thousand television channels and their allocation into private hands, the entire future of television, the future of what I call the most extraordinary communications instrument ever devised, surpassing the invention of printing, the invention of the motion picture, or any of the other great strides forward in the possibilities of communication between people, might be crystallized, and possibly irrevocably crystallized, for generations to come.

Later, at the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], who is chairman of the subcommittee to which the resolution was referred, we substituted for that resolution a much more specific set of proposals in the form of a new resolution and a bill. Joining us in sponsorship of these later measures were the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Still later we modified both these measures on the advice of present and past members of the Federal Communications Commission.

The most important among our proposals is the bill which would create a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television. This Board would consist of eleven outstanding private citizens—not Government officials—principally from the fields of education, publishing, public service, and civil life, to be selected by the President, to meet perhaps quarterly, and to be provided with a staff. The eleven appointees, of course, would be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The principal function of this Board would be to issue an annual advisory report to the Congress, to the Federal Communications Commission, and to the public, reviewing the year's progress, or lack of progress in the public service rendered by radio and television, and making suggestions as to how such public service could be further developed.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and his colleagues on the subcommittee have thus far given two days to hearing testimony on the bill and on the resolution. Thus far the witnesses have been entirely proponents, those favoring the resolution and the bill. The committee has indicated that it will hold further hearings after Congress reconvenes with further proponents, as well as opponents, to be heard. Chairman Wayne Coy of the Federal Communications Commission has not yet testified.

Among the opponents will be representatives of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. The staff of the Association professes to see in the proposed Citizens Advisory Board a threat of what it calls "indirect censorship." I have repeatedly explained how such a board could not possibly constitute such a threat. It is unimaginable that any President would

appoint to this board eleven men and women who would set themselves up as a board of censors; and it is inconceivable to me that the Senate would even confirm the nominations of eleven men and women, serving in an advisory capacity, as a board of censors.

The sensitivity of the industry to any possible criticism, even by an advisory board, is so great that I have no doubt that the association will continue to circularize its members, and that Members of the Senate will be hearing from some of their constituents to the effect that the first amendment to the Constitution is in danger.

Mr. President, the association breaks itself down throughout the country into seventeen local groups. A week or so ago I heard from eight of those groups which had theretofore met in local meetings and had all adopted resolutions condemning the proposed Citizens' Advisory Board.

Because of this allegation under the leadership of the officials of the Radio Trade Association, I wish to read into the RECORD a formal statement on this subject which I have just received from the American Civil Liberties Union. The American Civil Liberties Union, with its long experience in fighting for freedom of thought and expression, and fighting against suppression and against censorship, does not issue a statement of this kind lightly. Its members are dedicated to one objective, and one objective only, and that is the objective of freedom for the individual. Its record is known to all of us. Its statement wholly refutes the fears and charges of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. On the contrary, its statement shows that the proposed Citizens Advisory Board, far from developing a system of censorship, would have a result exactly the opposite. It would stimulate freedom and diversity of expression.

So here we have the case of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters resisting a proposal which, far from running counter to the spirit of the first amendment, actually would reinforce the freedom of speech to which the first amendment is dedicated. This freedom, of course, undergirds all our other freedoms.

Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour and the desire to adjourn as early as possible, I shall read only two sentences from this statement, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION SUPPORTING IN GENERAL S. 1579, A BILL ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

The American Civil Liberties Union believes that the best guide to the health of democracy and civil liberties is the degree to which free expression prevails in our Nation. And we believe that free expression should not be confined to subjects on which our people share similar opinions. Freedom of speech in our democracy is most meaningful when it specifically emphasizes comment on controversial issues which are constantly before the public for consideration.

It is this debate—the interchange of ideas—which is the best example of a free society in action, and is the surest guaranty of preserving freedom. It is the element which distinguishes a free democratic land from that of a Communist dictatorship.

In actively defending the principle of free expression, the American Civil Liberties Union has repeatedly stressed as a corollary of that principle the importance of diversifying speech through as many channels of communication as are possible. Specifically in the field of radio and television, we have emphasized the need for a diversified program schedule so that opposing points of view can be presented to the public.

The radio and television industry has done a great deal to disseminate information and to promote discussion through its facilities. But the establishment of a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television is one means of improving on that record. In its capacity as an advisory board, it can study and recommend how the principle of diversity can be faithfully followed and how numerous points of view on different issues of public concern can be expressed, within the limits of time and available facilities. The FCC Blue Book of 1946, in our opinion, pointed up the necessity of studying the allocation of time by radio stations so that the public interest is safeguarded by a balanced and diversified program schedule.

The statement has been made that the proposed advisory board will ultimately wield the power of censorship over program content or exert pressures which will interfere with the normal operations of radio and television stations. As an indefatigable watchdog of civil liberties, the American Civil Liberties Union is ever vigilant to any threat of censorship and we would be the first to register our opposition to this measure if we believed that censorship control over programs was the motive behind the bill. We should expect that the personnel of the board, which must be approved by the Senate, will be persons of the highest caliber—as are the members of a similar advisory board counseling the State Department on its information program—and devoted to the principle of a free and responsible radio-TV system in the United States. We understand, too, from our reading of the bill that the board's function is advisory; the bill does not propose that it usurp any of the work of the Federal Communications Commission.

The American Civil Liberties Union supports this bill because it places emphasis on the question of reserving television channels for educational stations, the Radio Committee of the Union, which is composed of lawyers, educators and specialists in various field of radio and television, has declared itself in favor of the principle of reserving TV for educational stations, in accordance with our general policy of promoting diversity in the ownership of media of mass communications.

Our dedication to freedom of information and expression also leads us to comment affirmatively on point (e) 3 of section 6, which deals with the advisory board's study of the types of control over programing exercised by commercial sponsors, and the effect of such control on the development of high-quality public service radio and television programs. In addition to observing if such control does not interfere with a balance schedule, a continuing study of this kind would be helpful to persons holding minority or unpopular opinions—or accused of having these beliefs—and whose opportunities to air these views are sometimes curtailed because of pressures exerted on commercial sponsors. This situation has arisen on several occasions, unfortunately after the speaker had been invited to participate in a program and his appearance announced to the public. Cancellation under these circumstances, we submit, is a denial

of the spirit of our constitutional guarantee of free speech, although perhaps not a technical violation.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I read from the statement:

It is this debate—the interchange of ideas—which is the best example of a free society in action, and it is the surest guaranty of preserving freedom. It is the element which distinguishes a free democratic land from that of a Communist dictatorship.

In actively defending the principle of free expression, the American Civil Liberties Union has repeatedly stressed as a corollary of that principle the importance of diversifying speech through as many channels of communication as are possible. Specifically in the field of radio and television, we have emphasized the need for a diversified program schedule so that opposing points of view can be presented to the public.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. For the information of the distinguished majority leader, I will say that I shall speak for about three or four more minutes. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Connecticut has stated, I joined him in the resolution and in the bill. It seems to me that the work of the Senator from Connecticut in this respect is extremely important. Before television moves too far along in definite grooves, it is important to have diverted a few educational and informational channels. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will keep up his good work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am extremely grateful for the expression of the Senator from Massachusetts. I know of the Senator's leadership in this field in his State, and the work he has done for the Lowell group in Boston. I know the pressure to which he and his associates will be subjected, because the subject is extremely unpopular with very powerful interests in our States, namely, the radio station operators and owners. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for the efforts he has made and for the fight he has been waging to assure that a part of our television facilities be preserved for educational purposes. Once we lose them, once they become devoted to non-educational purposes, we can never reclaim them. Now is the time to make the fight. I want to congratulate and commend the Senator from Connecticut on the battle he is waging.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the Senator's expression.

Mr. President, when the FCC issued its temporary order setting up ten percent of the television frequencies for educational institutions, the National Association of Broadcasters met and adopted a resolution condemning the action of the FCC and condemning the FCC for allocating ten percent of the allocations to what the national association referred to as "a limited use for a limited purpose."

It is as though we were to say that our school buildings should be torn down and

turned into apartment houses because they have such a limited use and serve such a limited purpose.

Worse than that, and equally alarming to me, are the rules that have slipped into the FCC regulations in recent years, by which educational institutions, under present rules, are bound when they get an allocation.

There is only one channel set up in my State of Connecticut for educational purposes, whereas the State commissioner of education wants four channels. There is only one channel set up in the great State of Massachusetts. There is not a single one set up in the State of New Jersey. As I pointed out before, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey are not without a record of leadership in the field of education. Two allocations have been made for all three States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall yield in a moment. First I wish to finish my explanation to the Senator from Alabama. Under an FCC regulation, if an educational institution secures one of these small number of licenses, it is prohibited from taking any money from anyone for any purpose. If it does so, it loses its license. That is to say, if Harvard University, for example, obtains a license in Boston and decides in its judgment to put on the Boston Symphony and to accept money in connection with putting on the Boston Symphony from a sponsor, or if it decides to sell extension courses, to try to teach people by television, and it charges a fee, just as it charges students who come to the university at night to take courses, it automatically becomes a commercial institution, even though the course may be operated for philanthropic purposes by a great university, such as Harvard University.

That is how far the rules of the FCC have infiltrated into our communications system to prevent the development of educational television.

I shall be glad to yield for a question to the Senator from Oregon, if he wishes to query me; but I shall have concluded my remarks in 3 or 4 minutes, unless I am interrupted.

I should like to quote from a letter sent on September 7 to the president of NAB by Mr. Paul Porter, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, now a highly respected and successful lawyer with important clients in the communications field. It is a significant letter which has come to me from a man whose law practice consists largely of clients in this field and who has the background of having been Chairman of the FCC. In this letter Mr. Porter is referring to a confidential news letter issued by the NAB, which Mr. Porter interprets in part as a personal attack upon me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. BENTON. I shall read only two paragraphs from the letter. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I find myself in accord with the feeling of the Senator from Con-

necticut with regard to the use of television for educational purposes. I should like to hear the Senator's comment on the fact, if he is aware of it, that, for example, we in Oregon have yet to receive from the Federal Communications Commission the allocation of a television channel for any purpose. I mention that in connection with the Senator's statement, to show how we in Oregon have been discriminated against in the television field.

Does the Senator from Connecticut think that action can be justified, in view of the argument he is making about television as a great medium of education for the American people?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am referring to the so-called "freeze" in connection with television. In my State there is only one television station, and the great Hartford area has no television station.

Two thousands channels are now about to be allocated, and of course they will be allocated to Oregon and to other parts of the country. That very fact raises the issue of what will be done in that field in the case of existing property rights which, in turn, can stand in the way of the development of public-service stations and educational programs.

I read now from the letter from Mr. Porter:

What you as president of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters should realize is that the American people are deeply aroused over the potential of television as a social force. It can bring great benefit or become an indifferent or detrimental influence in our society.

I do not believe you can foreclose discussion of these vital considerations by ill-conceived efforts to smear those who are sincerely concerned about the use of this great media in our daily lives. The interest of men like Senators BENTON, BRICKER, SALTONSTALL, and HUNT in these problems is a reflection of the widespread concern of the people of this country on this subject. I am sure that the industry itself treats this in a sincere and objective manner, and I suggest that unless the staff of its association takes a similar attitude it will do the industry a disservice and may invite really unpalatable remedies. Serious proposals by responsible people should not be met by slick innuendos or vilification. Nor should this vital question of public policy be obscured by unwarranted charges of censorship. The industry has a duty to oppose censorship, but it will endanger its future if it cries "wolf" recklessly and heedlessly. If Government really undertook censorship, I am sure that you would find Senators BENTON, BRICKER, SALTONSTALL, and HUNT resisting such a course with all possible vigor. But that is not the issue here, and, in my opinion, you are doing a great disservice to your membership by these tactics or personal attack.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to refer to, and place in the RECORD, a letter which I have received this month from Mr. Raymond Rubicam. I now ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Mr. Rubicam has retired from the advertising agency business. Of course, he is

one of the great names in the history of American advertising. I think most practitioners in that field will agree that during the thirties and forties, no advertising man was more highly admired and respected than was Mr. Rubicam. The agency he founded, Young & Rubicam, is one of the three or four largest in the world, and Mr. Rubicam himself is one of the great pioneers in the field of radio programing. He and the agency he founded helped set the present entertainment pattern in the field of radio broadcasting and, of course, in the field of television, which developed from radio broadcasting.

After retirement from his agency, Mr. Rubicam served for 2 or 3 years as the successor of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], as chairman of the research subcommittee of the Committee for Economic Development.

Mr. President, I make this reference to show that Mr. Rubicam is highly respected by the entire business community.

With his permission, I sent his letter to the distinguished editor, Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review of Literature. I hoped Mr. Cousins might wish to publish the letter. Somewhat to my surprise, my telephone rang the minute the letter reached Mr. Cousins' desk; he telephoned at once to me to express his gratitude for my sending the letter to him. He told me that any number of editors would be proud to publish the letter. I understand that the letter will be published as an article, over Mr. Rubicam's name, in next week's issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. If my colleagues do not happen to see the letter in that publication, I hope they will read the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am sure the Senate as a whole will agree with me that the letter speaks loud with the voice of experience and authority, coming as it does from a man who has operated from almost the very beginning in the advertising field.

Mr. President, I now conclude my remarks by expressing the hope that the Senators who have patiently listened to me today will read the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow.

EXHIBIT A

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ., October 3, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Radio broadcasting as conducted in the United States has come nowhere near serving the American people as well as it ought to have served them. I am convinced that a large part of the reason lies in the domination of radio by the advertiser. Since I am no longer in the advertising business these views will be called, by many of my former associates, the newly acquired righteousness of a reformed sinner, but the fact remains that even when I was most active in advertising and in radio I held the same views, and would have welcomed a reduction of the percentage of radio time available to advertisers, and an enlargement of the public's opportunity to hear programs which would have little worth for the advertiser but great worth for the public.

After that introduction, I need not say that it would be in my view a tragedy to see the development of television confined by

the limitations that have characterized radio. At the same time I would like to make it clear that I am a fighting believer in the constructive value and, in fact, the indispensability of advertising in a modern free economy. I believe that the public will benefit if television continues to be a major advertising medium. What I am opposed to is what amounts practically to a monopoly of radio and television by advertisers to the point where the public's freedom of choice in programs is more of a theory than a fact, and to the point where the public service of the two media is only a shadow of what it could be.

For the most part only sellers of products of the broadest mass appeal can afford to use radio and television advertising; therefore, for the most part, only audiences of the largest sizes are of value and interest to the advertiser. If the advertiser's program does not appeal to the number of people he wants and needs in order to maintain and increase his sales, he either grades his program down so as to reach more people, or if he cannot do that he gives up the program in favor of a new one that will reach more. Obviously television ought to have numerous programs of the wide popular appeal that the advertiser is looking for, but programing, instead of practically ending there, should only begin there. Radio programing in the United States has been comparable to a school system in which everything stopped at the elementary grades designed for the largest number of students, and which consequently had no colleges, universities, or postgraduate schools to serve the rest of the population.

This kind of allegation has been regularly denied by the broadcasting industry, which quotes this and that program of cultural or educational character, but anyone who twirls a dial any day or night anywhere in the country knows that those programs are so few in number that they have only slightly more relation to the general character of radio than the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" at prize fights has to prize fighting.

Educators rightly protest against our national habit of saddling the schools and colleges with most if not all of the blame for our educational shortcomings. The educators point out that schools and colleges have the human being under their tutelage only a few years of his life, and even in those years have him only part of the time, and that most of his education comes from what he hears, sees, reads, and does away from the classroom. In the field of print people have a lot better chance of escaping the worst than they have in radio. There are printed publications specializing in almost every field of human interest, inquiry, thought, activity. Such publications far outnumber the publications of mass circulation, and collectively they penetrate and serve the whole population, although their individual circulations are relatively small. It is also true of publishing that even those newspapers and magazines which typically take the low road to popularity often do more to serve minority interests and minorities among their readers than radio does.

One reason for radio's limitations by comparison with the printed word has been the physical restriction on the number of stations we can have. But another reason, and I am sure a more potent one, is that advertisers in newspapers and magazines do not select or control the editorial contents of those publications—and that many printed vehicles carry no advertising at all. In radio the advertiser largely determines what the public is offered in entertainment and information through his power of acceptance or rejection of programs, and because he is the sole source of broadcasting revenue. And the almost universal necessity for huge audiences to make the advertising pay has been a constant pressure downward on over-all

standards, and has led on the whole to a throttling of variety.

The infinite variety permitted by printed publication has helped bring man a long way in civilization. Without its stimulation to the many-sided occupations and talents of people, whether in work or recreation, the United States would never have become the accomplished nation it is. The further progress of American character, personality, and ability demands that individuals continue to be aided in following out many different lines of interest, inclination, and talent. While much of this job will continue to be done by the printed word, we nevertheless face an age in which a higher and higher percentage of what our minds take in will be taken in through radio and television. Their danger is that if misdirected they will make for a population standardized on a narrow base and a low level of preoccupation. In the end they are certain to overpower the printed word as an influence on people, and we are fools if we do not set them up to serve as much of our lives and to throw light on as many of our problems as they can.

The advertiser began paying for the public's radio because at the time that broadcasting started there seemed no way of collecting from listeners for the programs they selected, and the only way of collecting from the public at all seemed to be by means of a Government tax on radio sets, a proposal which understandably did not find favor, and which might very easily have brought radio too much under Government influence. But the seemingly insoluble problem which then existed of collecting directly from the public for its radio programs does not now exist in connection with television in view of such inventions and proposed services as Phonevision, Subscriber-Vision, and Telecoin, permitting programs to be received exclusively by those who pay for them. Such services could afford to broadcast, and could make money on, a wide range of programs appealing to much smaller groups or people than the advertiser would find profitable. When an advertiser sells goods as a result of a radio or television program the money he takes in must pay for his product as well as his program, hence his necessity for huge audiences. But the money taken in by the subscription broadcasters would go only to pay for the program. This, together with the fact that subscription broadcasters could charge prices generally comparable with motion picture admissions (more than many advertisers received for product and program), would make small audiences profitable. This in turn could mean that television broadcasting might eventually cover a range of subject matter almost as wide as the printed word now does. In entertainment, instead of radio's relatively invariable menu of crooning, crime, and gag-making, we might have not only current plays and movies, as has been pointed out, but everything else from the classics to woodworking—as-a-week-end hobby. I have seven grandchildren and, by a second marriage, two young children, ages 6 and 3, and I would feel a lot less helpless about their picture of the world if we had subscription television as well as advertising television.

Subscription broadcasting of television programs would create a new field for the free-enterprise system and would further the healthy competition we know we must have in business to keep it free and keep it serving us well. How can this proposal be seen in any other light?

As much as we need more varied entertainment in television, our need for more and better educational and informational programs is even greater. It seems to me that commercial subscription broadcasters could make important contributions in these fields, but that would be secondary to what could be done by stations devoted primarily to broad public education by qualified insti-

tutions, and it was very good news to me that the FCC had tentatively reserved a percentage of our potential television licenses for stations devoted to educational broadcasting. I note your questioning, and that of the New York Times and others, as to whether the FCC's ten percent is enough, and as to whether the proposed channels will provide enough power. These are matters about which I can have no opinion without far more information than I now have about all aspects of the problem. I suspect that most Members of Congress as well as people in general are in the same boat; and therein lies, to me, the importance of your fight for more time and more specific study—before it is too late—of what we ought to do from here on about the whole field of television. I could not agree more with anything you have said on the subject than I do with your statement that once we get set on the wrong lines with the remainder of our station assignments it will be too late to undo the damage.

Television, made free to serve the full range of public interest, and not confined to the narrow range of advertiser interest, is the best hope I know of to help us meet the strain which modern complexity puts on the process of self-government in a free society. With science rushing changes at us which affect every corner of our lives and bring every corner of the world closer, our need for greater grasp is desperate. (Our need for greater grasp of television is an example.) Our survival as a free people depends on our ability to acquire it. Apart from television's power to entertain, its power to inform is far beyond anything we have known, and probably far beyond what we now see.

You said in one of your earlier speeches in the Senate that the present international conflict is primarily and most importantly a war for men's minds. I imagine that many people who agree with you think that the way to win this war for men's minds around the world is to tell them a better story about democracy and freedom than the Soviets tell about communism. This is only part of the way to victory, much the lesser part. Regardless of what we say about ourselves via the Voice of America or other means, the kind of a people we are in action at home will speak much louder and in greater volume. No medium like television has ever before existed to reflect our character and actions now, and to help mold them for the future. Except for our military defense, what question is there before the country which is half as important as the question of the uses that will be made of television?

In asking for the creation of a National Citizens Advisory Commission to aid the public, the Congress and the FCC in thinking through the problems of this new force that has been thrust upon us, you are certainly on as sane and reasonable ground as any man could be on. You do not pretend to know all the answers, nor do you ask that the Government dictate the answers. What you ask is that the problems and possibilities be given the respect and study they deserve—and the public airing they ought to have—by a group of qualified citizens so that the best answers can be found. How can we afford to do less? And if we should have started on this earlier, as some say, we can still be thankful that you are fighting for it now, while there is still time.

My hat is off to you for your fight.

Yours sincerely,

RAY.

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the motion to adjourn is put, the Chair would like to wish all Senators a much deserved rest during the vacation between today and the 8th of January;

and the Chair wishes to thank all Members of the Senate for the unfailing courtesies they have shown the Chair.

The Chair wishes the same for all the employees of the Senate who have worked industriously for 10 months in undertaking to make the record of our performance as efficient as possible. The Chair wishes for them a very happy and restful vacation, and a return in January strengthened in body and mind.

The Chair would also like to express, for himself, and on the part of the Senate, his appreciation to the press, the newspaper reporters who sit day after day in the press gallery and disseminate information concerning our work. The Chair wishes to thank them not only for their patience but also for their forbearance in view of our shortcomings as a body. The Chair also wishes for them a very restful and well-deserved and happy vacation between now and January.

INDEPENDENT AND NONSCHEDULED AIR TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for a moment, because I wish to make a very few comments about the work of the committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. President, as this session draws to a close, I should like to call attention to the excellent work of the Select Committee on Small Business. Amid the various recriminations, charges, allegations and suspicions which have been brewing during the Eighty-second Congress, this committee has proceeded with outstanding harmony to do a job which may well have an abiding effect on our economy. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] we find that the committee has struck a significant blow for the competitive-enterprise system, not by the negative method of attacking the large corporations, but by the affirmative steps which it has taken to advance and strengthen the small-business enterprises.

Among its varied accomplishments has been the work of that committee in the field of aviation. The excellent report on irregular aviation and its potential role in civil air transportation offered the first solution to the problem of finding a proper place for this important and creative new segment of our air transport industry.

Regrettably, certain members of the Civil Aeronautics Board seem prone to ignore this report, and to continue blindly to conduct what appears to be an actually punitive campaign against the small independents—a campaign which apparently penalizes them for efficiency, service, and economy.

Recently one of these independents, Modern Airlines, was ordered to stop flying. The Senator from Alabama protested so effectively that this line was granted the right to continue flying. However, another line, Air Transport Associates, which flies from Seattle to Alaska, was ordered to cease flying, on the grounds that it was operating too frequently and regularly. I understand that the curtailing of its flights has resulted in considerable business upheaval

and actual hardship to the citizens of Anchorage and other Alaska communities. In fact, in Alaska there are a great number of groups and large numbers of persons who are exceedingly concerned about the conduct of the Civil Aeronautics Board in relation to this particular air transport service.

While the Congress is not in session, it is entirely possible that the Civil Aeronautics Board may intensify its campaign to eliminate the independent airlines, using the technique which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has described as "strangulation by administrative regulation."

Mr. President, I, for one, would not like to return to the Congress in January to find that the Civil Aeronautics Board had continued its policy of stalking, tracking down, and executing whatever embryo competition exists in our civil aviation. The fact that the independent airlines have grown to an almost \$200,000,000-a-year industry, in the face of such unwarranted administrative hostility by the Civil Aeronautics Board, is excellent proof that in America there is a real place for a nonsubsidized air-carrier industry.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he has in mind any program which will protect that segment of the aviation industry in the next few months, which may prove to be the critical period in the development of independent aviation. I should like to know whether the Senate Select Committee on Small Business intends to remain vigilant and watchful in regard to this problem while the Congress is not in session; and in that connection I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may be permitted to make a very brief reply to my question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has brought up this question, because it is one of considerable concern. I had hoped that before Congress adjourned I might have an opportunity to sit down with the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and discuss with them this very important matter.

I have not been able to do so; but I have instructed the staff of our committee to stay in touch with the Civil Aeronautics Board and continue discussions pertaining to this matter.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Oregon has said is absolutely true. I commend to the careful reading of every Senator the report of the Small Business Committee on this particular problem. The report is very brief. We made only a few recommendations; but one of them in particular was that especial attention be given to Alaska.

The Governor of Alaska testified before our committee, and a number of other citizens of Alaska also testified as to the importance of the nonscheduled air carriers, in order to have fresh food brought to Alaska.

Immediately upon cancellation of the line which was serving Alaska, we re-

ceived some very vigorous protests from merchants, from the Governor of Alaska, and from a great many others. It is a matter of great concern to the people of Alaska; and we should not forget that Alaska is often referred to as perhaps the weakest link in our defense chain. Certainly anything which weakens air transportation into Alaska further weakens the defense chain of which Alaska is an important part.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. CAPEHART rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama a question. Does he feel that the Civil Aeronautics Board erred in canceling the contract or permit of the airline about which he is talking?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a rather complicated matter, but it has not been an easy matter. I desire to say in all fairness to the Civil Aeronautics Board that it is a very difficult and complex problem to handle, and after the report and recommendation of the Small Business Committee, they agreed to withdraw the strangulation regulation which they had issued and to make a study of this problem, which they thought might require 18 months. By the way, they withdrew the order which had been directed against the line to which the Senator from Oregon referred. But when they did that they imposed a penalty on the other line the name of which as I recall is Air Transport Associates.

It did not mean much to me when I heard that that was the line from which they had withdrawn permission, or as they call it, the "certificate of exemption." I did not realize that that was a line which was serving Alaska; but it is.

My own personal feelings are that they ought to withdraw the order against Air Transport Associates, that they ought to pay special attention to the service which Alaska needs and requires, and they ought to carry on the study and work out some kind of program whereby the Nation will get full benefit of the economic defense value of the nonscheduled carriers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, I gather from the Senator's explanation that he is not prepared to say whether he thinks the Civil Aeronautics Board did or did not err in canceling the license.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the able Senator from Indiana pursues his subject. The question has been one relative to the regulation, which has been outstanding for a very long time, and which has granted the nonscheduled carriers a certificate of exemption and permitted them to operate, provided their operations would be infrequent and irregular. Who knows what the term "infrequent and irregular" means? Consequently the carriers have all been in doubt. They did not know whether it meant that they could fly every other day, or three times a week, or what it might mean.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Finally, the Board has recognized that when it issued this strangulation order, it said they could fly only three times a month between certain designated points, and only eight times a month between other points.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is, of course, that the Congress passed the law which the Senator has just described.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is some question in the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, the Senator, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, is not prepared, I gather from what he has said, to tell us whether he thinks the Civil Aeronautics Board did or did not err in canceling the permit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will put it in this way: I believe from the standpoint of policy they did. I am not prepared to say they did so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator, as chairman of the committee, prepared to say that he holds to the point of view that the CAB should allow more air service into Alaska rather than less?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Pending the study which they are making of the entire set-up, I certainly believe they ought to try to work out some arrangement whereby air transportation may be continued into Alaska.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about through. I only wish to say in conclusion that I am very glad to have the concurrence of the Select Committee on Small Business and to know that the committee is going to maintain its vigilance over this problem of aviation, because I think any study of the record will show that the small airline companies are being unfairly discriminated against by the CAB. Once again we need to be constantly on guard against the development of a subsidized monopoly, in this instance, in the field of aviation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question along the line of his remarks?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am deeply interested in the remarks of the Senator, and in the subject matter which he is discussing. I know that Senators want to conclude the business of the session, and in order to save time, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will allow me to ask unanimous consent to place in the Record a statement which I have prepared on the subject.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

It would be improper for me to try the patience of this body with any lengthy discussions, at this late hour, of the problem involved in the relationship between administrative agencies and the Congress.

However, there is one matter which should be dealt with before adjournment, since serious and perhaps irreparable damage may take place, during our absence, unless proper warning is given at this time. On August

29, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] addressed the Senate, speaking in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. That committee had completed a most able and detailed report on the problem of the independent air-carriers, the so-called non-skeds, in our civil aviation industry. That report called upon the CAB to follow a definite and positive program regarding these useful, unsubsidized air carriers which have pioneered and developed valuable new frontiers in flying. That report also called upon the Civil Aeronautics Board to cease and desist from its program of eliminating these independent enterprises for flying "too regularly and too frequently." It asked that violations be set aside until a new policy is set forth which allows a proper and legal place in aviation for carriers which have so clearly demonstrated their ability to fly safely and serve the public with the lowest cost and most rapid transportation ever achieved in the history of man's mechanical and economic ingenuity. This unanimous Senate Small Business Committee report was issued on July 10 of this year.

As I indicated, Senator SPARKMAN was constrained to address the Senate on August 29, because the CAB had just executed another independent airline. This was done without any notice being given to the Senate Small Business Committee or heed being paid to the report of that committee. That particular airline has been reinstated, largely as a result of the forthright stand of the Senator from Alabama.

The junior Senator from Alabama was aroused, and I feel that if anything, he showed great restraint and forbearance in this matter. I quote a few of the Senator's remarks:

"I have been disappointed in the fact, first of all, that the Civil Aeronautics Board apparently has made no effort to work out a program whereby this tremendous asset to the economy, the security, the defense of the United States may be maintained. I believe that, if necessary, legislation should be enacted to safeguard against such a death sentence as the Board promulgated some time ago. Certainly I believe that we ought to express most strongly our disapproval of the slow death by strangulation that they are practicing now by administrative order. We recognized the danger from the very beginning, that one by one, as they come up to apply for exemption, the Board could refuse to give them exemption, their right to continue to operate for another year, and, therefore, they would be forced out of business. Instead of all of them being forced out of business at once, they are gradually being forced out as they come up, one by one. It may be a slower death, it may be less painful, but it is just as certain and it is just as harmful and just as destructive to the economy and the security of the country. We should keep our implied pledge when we sold our surplus airplanes to those young veterans in order that they might go into the business.

"Clearly, the majority of CAB seems bent on ignoring the Senate. Apparently the CAB would like to turn its back on the solution to this problem which was offered by the Senate Small Business Committee and which recognized, along with the CAB and the rest of the air industry, that irregular flight by large passenger equipment are uneconomical and uneconomical. The CAB's decision in this recent case is but a further example of the Board's unwillingness to recognize any of the economic realities of aviation.

"Certainly such a policy by this administrative agency, carried on in spite of the express wish of a committee of Congress, and in defiance of the economic forces which are so potently at work in air transportation today, must lead this Board to a position where

all of its decisions, and its very competence will be seriously questioned. Our committee sought an equitable solution and set forth a possible course. But we have yet to see any action by the Board indicating that it is sincerely trying to expand civil aviation with broadest possible public service as its goal. Instead, we see continued the attitude of a Board that is insensitive to the will of Congress and to the needs of the community."

I am not discussing the merits of free competition in aviation and the role of independent small business—matters about which the senior Senator from New Mexico feels most strongly. I am talking about the willful and flagrant disregard on the part of administrative agencies for the express wishes and purposes of the Congress. We set up these agencies, we appropriate the public funds for their operation and we find, after a few years, that they have become a law unto themselves, operating solely within their own discretion, relying upon the tremendous preoccupation of the Congress to give them immunity. We are too occupied on too many fronts to give detailed personal attention to each and every agency. We cannot appoint "watchdog committees" to oversee these agencies which cover the complex phases of American life. We must rely upon the good faith of the various administrative heads not to flout the will of Congress and not to play fast and loose with the public interest.

Recently the CAB announced that it was undertaking a detailed study of the problem of the 63 large irregular air carriers, and that, according to the CAB's announcement, "the scope of its investigation would include all matters relating to and concerning non-scheduled-air transportation operated by these 63 carriers, and whether or not there is a need for this non-scheduled air transportation in addition to and supplemental to the regular and frequent air transportation performed by the scheduled air carriers over specific routes."

Now, they also stated that pending the completion of this investigation they would continue to enforce their constrictive and limiting regulations, and they announced that they would use "the same tests and the same standards" which they have been using up to the present for the elimination of these independent enterprises. If the board pursues this policy all the independent carriers will be out of business by the time the study is completed.

As if to illustrate this, the CAB issued an order suspending an independent air carrier, Air Transport Associates, Inc., which flies from Seattle to Alaska, bringing much of the fresh food and freight which is the salvation of the struggling Alaska communities. The board's death sentence on this airline was issued on August 29, simultaneously with its order for a complete study of the problem.

Now that Congress is adjourning, what indication is there that the next few months will not see a continuation of this process of "strangulation by regulation," as Senator SPARKMAN describes it, and what assurance do we have by the time the CAB has completed its story, it will not with its left hand have liquidated the most important independent lines, and thus have broken the backbone of the competitive branch of air transportation?

I submit that if we return in January and find that the vendetta against the independents has been continued, and we find that other non-skeds have also received or are about to receive the treatment of the Air Transport Associates, we will be in the position of coroners holding an inquest over the corpse of free enterprise in aviation.

If, during the intervening months another nonscheduled independent is put out of business, I think this would be an act of bad

faith on the part of the CAB toward the Congress.

I hope that the able Senator from Alabama, and his distinguished colleagues of the Senate Small Business Committee, will continue their vigilance, and protect the freedom of our skies for safe, economical, forward-looking aviation. I do not believe that the spacious skies which we sing about in our patriotic anthem were meant to be cut up and subdivided for the exclusive use of a few subsidy-minded corporations. There must be no monopoly in civil aviation, and the best guaranty against monopoly is a healthy spirit of free competition.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOODY ORDERED PRINTED IN THE RECORD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY]. It is an advance copy of a speech which it has been my privilege to read today, and which he will deliver next Monday evening, October 22, to the Economic Club of Detroit. It is an exceedingly able speech, which is deserving of a reading by his colleagues in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERMINATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the motion I made to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 289, terminating the war with Germany—a motion which failed to achieve its purpose because of the unusual celerity with which the wheels of our legislative machinery turned yesterday—I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with a memorandum relating to the constitutionality of the proviso in House Joint Resolution 289.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951.

HON. TOM CONNALLY,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign
Relations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the time that House Joint Resolution 289 (to end the war with Germany) was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, I entertained some doubts as to the wisdom of such reference. The decision to end the war is naturally a matter with which the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, but the proviso of that resolution which retains the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act is a matter with which the Committee on the Judiciary is vitally concerned. I have made an extensive study of the matter, and it leads me to suggest that this resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There are two sound jurisdictional reasons why the Committee on the Judiciary should have House Joint Resolution 289 referred to it. Both of these are set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1946. That act gives the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over (a) the revision and codification of United States statutes, and (b) measures relating to claims against the United States.

Of primary concern to the Judiciary Committee is the proviso which relates to the Trading With the Enemy Act. There is a serious question of the constitutionality of this proviso, since it is subject to the construction that the United States may continue to vest property which was subject to vesting prior to January 1, 1947. As an incident of that problem, another legal question arises as to whether this proviso does in fact authorize continued vesting of German property.

Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was enacted as part of the War Claims Act, gives rise to other constitutional questions. That section prohibits the return of vested property to nationals of Germany. If vesting may still take place, that will amount to confiscation since section 39 prohibits a return. At least as far as friendly German aliens in this country are concerned, it is doubtful that this provision would be constitutional.

I am certain, Senator, that you appreciate my concern in this matter, and you may rest assured that I will attempt to satisfy any questions you may care to address to the Committee on the Judiciary in this regard. Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 289 TERMINATING WAR WITH GERMANY

This resolution provides that any property or interest therein which was subject to vesting or seizure under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, or which has already been vested or seized under that act prior to January 1, 1947, shall continue to be subject to the provisions of that act. The language of House Joint Resolution 289 authorizes the future vesting of property. Under the resolution, property which could have been vested prior to the termination of the state of war may still be vested pursuant to the act. There is no indication in the House report accompanying House Joint Resolution 289 that this resolution seeks to enable continued vesting after passage of the resolution. It indicates that the resolution enables the United States to continue to hold vested property seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Section 5 (b) (1) of the Trading With the Enemy Act authorizes the vesting of any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof during time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President.

Section 7 (c) of the Trading With the Enemy Act provides for the seizure of any property belonging to, or held for the benefit of, any enemy by the Alien Property Custodian. Under section 2 of the act "enemy" is defined as "any individual . . . of any nationality, resident within the territory . . . of any nation with which the United States is at war."

The Provisions in House Joint Resolution 289, with respect to continued vesting, is that any property or interest therein "shall continue to be subject to the provisions of that act in the same manner and to the same extent as if this resolution had not been adopted." The language importing that the property might be seized may be surplusage, but some proponents of this part of the proviso assume that the seizure can be accomplished.

The language of the proviso is broad enough to subject it to the possible construction that the state of war is ended except for the Trading With the Enemy Act. If the state of war is continued in this regard when in fact it has terminated in all other respects, it is not consistent with the cases (cited below) decided under the war power of the Constitution. It is certainly not con-

sistent with the policy of this resolution as stated in the House report accompanying it. That policy is stated to be friendship between Germany and the United States, so that the German people may be brought more closely into the Western Alliance.

House Joint Resolution 382, which was approved March 3, 1921, sought to provide the termination date for the state of war in the First World War. It provided in regard to the Trading With the Enemy Act that it should be excepted from the operation and effect of this resolution. This would indicate that Congress after the First World War allowed the state of war to continue in relation to the Trading With the Enemy Act. If this proposition is correct, then continued vesting after World War I was still possible under the act, although there was no express provision for it as there is in this resolution.

Continuing the state of war in this regard raises another problem under sections 9 and 33 of the act. Congress must continue to provide additional periods in which claims may be filed for the return of this property or the constitutionality of this power to continue vesting is at best doubtful. *Stohr v. Wallace* (see subsequent discussion).

There is likewise a constitutional question as to whether Congress may retain a state of war in regard to one particular piece of legislation such as the Trading With the Enemy Act. Under article I, section 3, clause 11, Congress can declare war. That condition or state exists until terminated by proclamation, treaty, or joint resolution. (See House report accompanying H. J. Res. 289). As an incident of ending the state of war, it would appear wholly logical that Congress may adopt a piecemeal method and exclude ending the state of war in regard to one act, such as the Trading With the Enemy Act. To do so, however, may accomplish three doubtful aims: (1) It first of all maintains in operation an office of the executive branch with vesting powers when the need for such an activity is doubtful; (2) it secondly adopts a policy of vesting property during otherwise peaceful times when the purpose of vesting enemy property has ceased to exist. The policy behind the Trading With the Enemy Act has been to prevent economic interests under the control of the United States from being used against the United States during an actual period of conflict; (3) and thirdly the exception created by this resolution in regard to the Trading With the Enemy Act defeats in part the primary objective of the resolution, which as expressed in the House report is to restore friendly relations between Americans and Germans.

The cases which have upheld the constitutionality of the Trading With the Enemy Act do little more than provide a background upon which the decisions, which now confront the committee, can be made. Seizure under section 7 (c) has been held to be within the war powers of Congress and not to be a denial of due process. *Great Northern Ry. Co. v. Sutherland Alien Property Custodian* (273 U. S. 182, 47 S. Ct. 315 (1927)).

It has likewise been held under section 7 (c) that seizure without the right of the owner to have his claim determined before seizure is constitutional in view of the right to bring suit under section 9 to get it returned. *Stohr v. Wallace* (269 F. 827 (DCNY 1920) affirmed 255 U. S. 239, 41 S. Ct. 293 (1921)).

In *Biesantz v. Supreme Council of Royal Arcanum* (175 N. Y. S. 46, 106 Misc. Rep. 549 (1919)) that the summary seizure of property is the exercise of the right conferred on Congress under article I, section 8, clause 11, and section 9 of the act satisfies the fifth amendment as to due process.

In *Henkels v. Miller* (4 F. (2d) 988 (CCANY 1925)) reversed on other grounds (271 U. S. 298, 46 S. Ct. 524 (1926)), the court held that Congress in time of war may authorize the

seizure of property believed to be enemy owned, if adequate provision is made for its return in case of mistake.

In the light of these decisions, if House Joint Resolution 289 does provide for vesting property, it would not stand up constitutionally. The Trading With the Enemy Act is authorized under the war power (*Stohr v. Wallace*, supra), and it is strictly a war measure. Clearly when the state of war is terminated, the authority under that clause ceases. Furthermore, the entire policy of the Trading With the Enemy Act is designed to prevent property under the control of the United States from being used against it in time of war. With the termination of the state of war that policy likewise ceases.

Aliens, as well as citizens, are entitled to the protection of the due process clause of the fifth amendment, *U. S. v. Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 62 S. Ct. 552 (1942)), citing *Russian Fleet v. U. S.* (232 U. S. 481 at p. 489). Undoubtedly the vesting of the property of a friendly alien, especially one residing in this country, would be a violation of this amendment.

If a technical state of war is allowed to exist in regard to this one act, the constitutional arguments against continued vesting may disappear, but the three above-mentioned policy arguments against the proviso remain.

Another constitutional problem will be resolved perhaps in the next term of the Supreme Court. Section 39, which is a recent amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, denies returns of property to German and Japanese nationals. *Guessefeldt v. McGrath* upheld the literal interpretation of that section, but did not go into the constitutional issues when a German national was denied return of his property. *Nagano v. McGrath*, in applying the same section, indicated that if interpreted literally so as to deny all returns, there were grave doubts as to the constitutionality of section 39 under the fifth amendment. In both cases applications are now pending before the Supreme Court. (Both cases are subsequently discussed.)

Section 39 probably is entirely valid in its application during time of war. Just as positively the same section, if sought to be enforced after the termination of the war, appears invalid, at least in regard to friendly aliens.

ELIMINATION OF THE PROVISIO

If the proviso in House Joint Resolution is eliminated, there is a conflict of opinion whether any return can be made to a German or Japanese national (sec. 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act; sec. 12, 62 Stat. 1246, 50 U. S. C. App.). Section 39 was passed as a part of the War Claims Act. Its language is specific and sweeping in denying return of "any property or interest therein of Germany or Japan or any national of either such country vested . . . at any time after December 17, 1941 . . . to former owners thereof or their successors in interest."

In *Guessefeldt v. McGrath* (U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit, May 3, 1951) (present Supreme Court Docket No. 204) section 39 was interpreted literally and consequently no national of Germany, wherever resident or however loyal, etc., can recover property any longer. As long as this interpretation is given effect, the elimination of the proviso will have no effect on whether Germans are considered enemies or just aliens.

Just prior to the decision in the *Guessefeldt* case, *Nagano v. McGrath* (U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, February 26, 1951) (present Supreme Court Docket No. 169) was decided. In that case, it was determined that section 39 was not intended to repeal section 9 (which allows the party

whose property was taken to sue for a return) and consequently friendly alien residents could recover untainted American property. In this opinion, the court admitted that section 39, if literally construed, would prohibit a return to any national. The court in the Nagano case felt, however, that Congress did not intend "to deprive non-enemy-alien residents of the United States of their existing right to recover property owned by them."

Under this decision, it would seem that Germans residing in Germany during the war would still be unable to get their property. Unfriendly German aliens would likewise be excluded from a recovery. But Germans residing in this country who fall into the category of nonenemy residents would be entitled to a recovery. And to this extent the War Claims Fund would be diminished.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure I voice the sentiments of every Member of this body, the employees of the Senate, and the members of the press, when I say that the words spoken by the great Vice President of the United States, expressing his wishes for a pleasant vacation, are fully reciprocated by each and every one of us. When the Senate reconvenes again, we shall expect to see the Vice President in his accustomed place, with all of his wisdom, the fruition of years of experience, with all of his sense of fairness, as well as his sense of humor, which combine to make him a great American.

Mr. President, before the Senate shall adjourn sine die I should like to give expression of my admiration for the services performed during this session of the Senate by the distinguished majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. Not in my time, and I know of few instances in parliamentary history, has any man occupied that position who has been confronted with more difficult problems than has the Senator from Arizona. They have not only been difficult problems, but new problems of great perplexity have arisen when we did not have the lamp of experience to guide us in our deliberations.

The Senator from Arizona has brought to bear in the discharge of his duties a patience far beyond that possessed by most of the human family. He has brought to the arduous duties of majority leader an understanding of human nature, great ability, and perseverance that have enabled him to make a magnificent record of service.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about this Congress, but I predict that when the historian of the future looks beneath all the confusion which has attended some of our deliberations, when he peers beyond the numerous investigations which have been held, and hearings of one kind or another, he will say that this session of Congress had a record of solid legislative achievement. I say that without fear, because I believe during this session of Congress we took steps which will contribute to the strengthening of America, to the solidification of the free world, and to arresting the aggression of forces that threaten the rights and liberties of mankind everywhere.

A man of lesser strength of character would have folded up under the terrific pressure brought to bear upon him. I am proud to have served in this body with the distinguished Senator from Arizona and to have endeavored to assist him in his many duties, and I am proud to claim him as a friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to express my gratification for the words of the Senator from Georgia. I appreciate the tribute he has paid to the Vice President, who is not only one of the most remarkable men, but one of the greatest Americans in our history.

I had the honor to serve with the distinguished Senator from Georgia on the Democratic Policy Committee under the chairmanship of our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona. I think I should say, and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me, that in that committee we have a pretty keen insight into the many vexing, and I may say, at times almost unfathomable problems. The majority leadership is always in a position of tremendous responsibility and always requires the greatest ability and skill, but I believe that in all my years of service, both in the House and in the Senate, I have never known a time when the majority leader carried such great burdens or had such a difficult task as the majority leader has had during this session of the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Georgia in commending the patience, the devotion, and the character of the distinguished majority leader, and to testify how ably and well he has performed the duties entrusted to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is particularly pleasant for me to join with the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee of which I am a member, in the remarks he has just made. I may say to the Vice President that he wields his gavel with a sense of humor which is always delightful and which makes us glad he is coming back in January to wield it again. Even when his face looks severe and he wields the gavel hard, he wields it with fairness and with utter absence of partiality.

Mr. Vice President, on behalf of Senators on this side of the aisle, I wish you a pleasant vacation. We hope that your speeches will be as friendly and favorable to us on this side of the aisle as they will be to those on the other side of the aisle, because I know you are capable of making them so.

I wish the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] were here to express the sentiments of Members on this side of the aisle. I know what he would say regarding the majority leader. I know he would say that it is easy to work with him, that he is courteous, fair, and temperate in his dealings with us on this side of the aisle. In the brief time in which I have been occupying the chair of the acting minority leader we have

had a good time together; we have worked together, and, so far as I know, we have not added too much to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in working to bring the session to a close.

I hope the majority leader will have a happy time in Arizona. While it was hot in Arizona he kept us here; while it was cool in Massachusetts in the middle of the summer he kept us here. Now he sends me to snow and he goes back to warm weather in Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In reference to the speeches which the Chair will make during the recess, he is reminded of the man who had for most of his life gone to town every Saturday and returned in an inebriated condition. One Saturday his wife said to him "Will you please come home sober tonight?" He said, "I will do my best."

She said, "Let us kneel down and pray."

He prayed, "Lord, help me to do right."

Getting nearer to town, he said, "Lord, help me to do about right."

Going into town, and knowing what would happen, he said, "Lord, help me to do as right as the circumstances will permit." [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the genuine expressions of admiration and respect made by the junior Senator from Georgia concerning the distinguished Vice President and the very able majority leader. I am very grateful for the opportunity of having worked under the leadership and direction of both of them during the first session of this Congress.

I have been rather closely associated with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] from early in the morning until late in the evening. I have always found him to be a fair, patient, tolerant Senator and a very able leader. This session of Congress has been one of the most significant, in my judgment, in the history of the Republic. It has also been one of the most unique. It is unique, I think, because of the type of legislation we have considered and enacted rather than for the quantity that has been passed. I think the quality of the legislation that has been passed by this body is largely the result of the counsel, leadership, and assistance of the great majority leader, with the aid of the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], and the acting minority leader [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I believe historians will show that this has been a preparedness Congress, a Congress which has looked to the future instead of to the past, and when its history is finally written I know that in it the able leader of the majority will play a prominent part.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed particularly regarding our majority leader.

About 30 minutes ago I went to his desk and said to him, "Mac, you have not disappointed anyone. You have been patient, you have been courageous, you have been helpful, you have been a genuine leader."

Mr. President, while of course our first thoughts turn to our majority leader, I wish to say for the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is ill, and who is not present this evening, that he has been most cooperative, and has at all times shown a spirit of helpfulness in expediting the work of the Senate, and he certainly has extended me courtesies, for which I am grateful.

I feel that I would be remiss if I did not say that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority whip, has been simply marvelous to all of us.

Mr. President, I desired to express these sentiments for the RECORD.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. It is a pleasure and privilege not only to endorse but to claim as my own the sentiments which have been so generously and eloquently expressed with respect to the great man who presides over this body, and with reference to our esteemed, respected, and able majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] and his great assistant, the able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arizona and his outstanding assistant, our colleague from Texas, it is my conviction that the majority party has been instrumental, in this session of the Congress, in proving its worthiness of the confidence of the people.

Mr. President I should like to say just a word of esteem and affection for the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is absent today because of illness. I have written him a letter in which I told him that I miss him, and, frankly, I do. In my opinion the welfare of his party has certainly been ably guarded by those who were here, but I cannot help feeling that it would have fared better had he been present. I wrote him that I was torn between two emotions, a feeling of gratification that his party was not doing any better than it was in his absence, and at the same time a personal desire to see him return at as early a time as possible, but in such a manner as not to further the cause of his party too much.

I would not say that there was any similarity in my feeling toward the majority leader to that expressed by one who was referring to the fact that his best friend had run off with his wife, and who was expressing his deep disappointment at what had occurred. He said, "I certainly hope they return early, because I miss him so much."

Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for yielding to me for this expression, and say to him and to the other Members of this great body, on this side of the aisle, as well as those on the other side, that I had great joy in serving with him and with them, and I extend my very best

wishes to the Members of the Senate for a fine vacation and for a safe return.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. As one who did not vote for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] in the Democratic caucus when we met to choose a majority leader in January, I take great pleasure in associating myself with the Senator from Georgia and the other distinguished speakers in expressing my admiration for the fine and helpful manner in which the majority leader has discharged the great responsibilities of his office.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that there has never been a time, there certainly has not been within my memory, when the country was faced with so many serious problems, so many tremendous difficulties, in meeting which the action of the Congress meant so much to the security and welfare of our country. To have been an able and successful majority leader during that period is a pinnacle which few people have had the privilege of attaining, and which few people could have discharged so well as the present majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The quality of the work we have performed in the Senate is for the American people to judge, but the friendship with the type of men with whom we have been associated during our service in the Senate is a privilege which each of us can enjoy, as we come to appraise and to judge the caliber of these men.

I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of the younger Members of this august body when I say that all the Senators who are serving in the Senate, including the lady from the great State of Maine, have been most courteous to us at all times.

A short time ago we had a little party in which the new Members extended their felicitations to our distinguished majority leader. I stated at that time that each of us had the highest respect and admiration for him, and that respect and that admiration grew from day to day. He has always been very courteous, he has always been very sympathetic and understanding, and he has earned for himself a well-deserved affection. I earnestly hope that he and his family will enjoy a well-earned period of rest and relaxation, that they will find invigoration, and that he will come back in January and give to the country the quality of leadership he has heretofore furnished on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I would not stop with these words, because there are many others who deserve our praise and gratitude. The Vice President of the United States has always been understanding and courteous to the younger Members of the Senate. Also to Felton Johnston, secretary to the majority, to Charlie

Watkins, the Parliamentarian, and to all the other officials of the Senate, we are deeply grateful for the fine treatment they have extended to us. I hope they will all enjoy themselves during the vacation period.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in but a moment I shall yield the floor. I was not upon the floor of the Senate when a resolution was passed extending the cordial good wishes of the Senate for an early recovery to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I should be false to a friendship which I highly prize, which I prize beyond words, if I did not take this occasion to profess my profound sorrow that sickness has taken him from the Senate for such a length of time, and to express my earnest hope that he will experience an early recovery and will be his own ebullient, fighting self when the Senate reconvenes in January 1952.

Mr. President, I served with the Senator from Nebraska when he was majority leader and while he has been minority leader. I have been arrayed against him in legislative strife. There have been occasions when he and I have seen eye to eye and fought side by side. He is a fine, stalwart American, with a highly developed sense of fairness and fair play. He has made a great contribution to the functioning of this body. As one who prizes his personal friendship, I wish to add my expression of sincere hope that he will soon be fully restored to health and return to this body and to his friends.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made in tribute to the Vice President, and also to the leaders of the Senate. It is a difficult task to preside over a body composed of 96 Members from 48 States, representing various philosophies of government and different ideas. The Vice President discharges that duty with great care and judgment. I am sure that all Senators feel that as a presiding officer he has been fair in his judgments, even though at times we may exercise the parliamentary prerogative to appeal from the decision of the Chair. That casts no reflection whatever upon the decision of the Chair, which is rendered honestly, and which is right as he sees it.

The majority leader has a very difficult position. He fills it very ably, and with great distinction. It requires great ability, energy, and effort to fill that position. I know I speak also for all members of the minority in expressing affectionate appreciation of the courtesies he extends to us daily.

I am sure that the burden of work in the Senate has caused the illness of the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY]. We all regret his absence at this particular time because of illness. We wish for him a speedy recovery. In his absence the minority has had the good fortune to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] available to discharge the functions of acting leader, which he has done with his characteristic competence and good will.

These men must carry on the work of the Senate. Their positions are difficult to fill, in view of the great variety of opinion in the Senate. However, we recognize that they are discharging their duties honestly and with the judgment which God has given them. We appreciate their service.

This is the outstanding legislative body in all the world. It is composed of 95 men and one woman. Its Members carry on the great traditions of the United States of America, which believes in a government of laws and not of men. Here we help make the laws which are binding upon all our citizens. There is no greater trust than the work of the Congress of the United States. I am sure that every Member of each body feels that responsibility and seeks to meet it courageously and conscientiously.

If it were not for the great personalities in the Senate and the friendships which we develop among Senators, whether they be on the minority side or the majority side, it would be impossible to carry this great burden. It would wear out the souls and spirits of men. But we are daily revitalized by our friendships with these men and those other employees of the Senate who serve along side us. I want to express my personal appreciation to each of them—the members of the committee staffs, the Parliamentarian, the official reporters, the secretaries and all others, not neglecting the pages. All of them serve their jobs loyally and with good will. It is in such an atmosphere that we as Senators are constantly revitalized and enabled to carry forward our own tasks.

In closing, I wish all Senators and all members of the staff connected with the Senate a very pleasant vacation. I know that they deserve it because of their work here. I hope that everyone will be able to return in January refreshed and revitalized by reason of the strength which we receive from back home, from the people in whose name we seek to carry on the great tradition of the making of laws for the Government of our Nation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to say one word about my friend, the able majority leader. If there must be a Democrat as majority leader, I hope it will always be McFARLAND.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have not hitherto joined in the chorus of praise and gratitude to the Vice President and to the majority leader and minority leader, because I thought that almost everything had been said that could be said. I wish now to state that I heartily approve those tributes of praise and gratitude.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am not surprised to hear the expressions of praise and commendation for our majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND]. I remember that when we were looking around to choose someone to be majority leader we considered many points. One of the points we considered was that we wanted someone who had the necessary tact and ability to meet all the problems we might face in the Senate this year and next year. We decided upon the junior Senator from

Arizona. I am satisfied today, after listening to both Republicans and Democrats praise our majority leader, that we did not make a mistake. I know that in the future we will find that he will continue to be the great leader that he has shown himself to be during this session.

DISCONTINUANCE OF TRIS COFFIN'S TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, without taking the time to read it, a statement which I have prepared relative to Tris Coffin's television program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many of us who have appeared on Tris Coffin's television program, or who have watched it were surprised to learn that Thursday that it will not longer be on the air. It will be replaced, I suppose by lady wrestlers or the strained comedy that burdens television these days.

I know many will share my view that this program, Washington Report, brought to the American public important issues clearly and without the rancor that seems to be a "must" in so many television public events programs. Tris Coffin was giving real public service, and I regret that DuMont Television has not kept it on the air.

There should be a place for this kind of sympathetic, factual approach to the issues you and I face every day in this Chamber. How can our people make up their minds if they cannot see both sides of the issues that concern us? I know there must be others who are sorry this valuable program must disappear.

ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a constituent in Michigan who demands to know what a Republican is doing about inflation. I have replied to his letter, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my reply to that constituent.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. ——. Your letter asks many questions which I will try to answer as best I can, but they all center around the special squeeze which present day inflationary conditions puts upon the middle class. Every class is hit by inflation, but people on relatively fixed incomes suffer most. I join wholeheartedly with you in your indignation over this situation and I will tell you what Republicans have been trying to do about it. But first I will try to answer your specific questions.

You ask: "What is the answer of the Republican Senator to a question—not about the expense of executive spending in the Federal Government at this time—but about the threat of inflation to most of the middle class?"

This question apparently does not want me to mention Federal spending, yet expects me to say something constructive about avoiding inflation. Surely, it is not contended that there is no connection between the two.

The prime cause of inflation is Federal Government spending. This is elementary economics. For 20 years the New and Fair Deal based their political success on lavish spending and today the country is paying the price for it in inflation.

What do you think happens when the Government uses every conceivable device

to pump more money into the economic stream than it collects in taxes? By constantly enlarging spending programs the Government causes four things to happen: (1) Your taxes have to be raised to meet part of the deficit. The administration has added millions of people to the tax rolls and has raised taxes again and again since it has been in office. The latest raise results in Government taking a quarter or more of your income. (2) The national debt is increased. This increases both the present and future cost of Government which you and your children, and their children, will have to pay. (3) The Government has to borrow from banks to make up the deficit caused by overspending. This increases the money supply and pumps it into the economic stream with an inflationary result. (4) Excessive appropriations lessen the supply of goods and services for civilian consumption. Government employment is not productive and diverts manpower from productive enterprise, thus lessening the potential supply of goods. Government consumption of materials lessens the actual supply for civilian use. The combined result is to increase the gap between available goods and services and the demand, which is known as the inflationary gap because it drives up prices for the supply that is available to the consuming public.

Government spending goes mainly for three broad purposes: (1) To provide tremendously expanded welfare services for the sick and aged, for veterans, for workers' social security, unemployment and relief assistance, for hospitals, schools, and children's lunches; and so on; (2) for enlarged public-works programs; housing; aids, subsidies, and grants to farmers; loans to industry; and (3) loans, grants, and aids to foreign countries, and the financing of World War II followed by the present gigantic rearmament and military program. No matter how worthwhile all of these activities may be, the Government financing of them put billions of dollars into the pockets of our people without producing anything to spend it on. War goods are destroyed. Foreign-aid programs send resources and goods out of the country. Social services in the country are free. Some farm and industrial production is increased by subsidies and loans, but not enough to take up the slack. But the money paid in wages for the production of all the goods removed from the economic system, and the extra money pumped into the system by Government borrowing, remains. The result is a tremendous oversupply of money relative to goods and services. Inflation is the certain result.

Inflation makes it possible for Government to do many things in a hurry for farmers, workers, business, young and old people, and for the sick and destitute, which the private economy may not be able to do for itself, or could do only over a longer period of time.

Many of these benefits are very worth while, but the Government cannot do every worth-while thing any more than a family can with its own income without paying a price for it. The fallacy lies in the people's belief, encouraged by the Democrat administration to gain votes and remain in power, that Government can give them something for nothing. That is why the people are surprised and angry now that Government largess demands a price. The price is inflation, steadily increasing taxes, Government interference in people's lives and business, Government favoritism and corruption, and a dangerous tendency toward socialism with all that socialism implies. The proof of these ill effects is on every page of our newspapers.

The fallacy is further compounded by the people's belief that Government subsidies and controls is the solution for painful inflation. You ask why we should not give subsidies, impose price ceilings and rent con-

controls. This is just what the administration encourages you to do. Having got us into the mess, it is forced to look around for fake panaceas in order to shift the blame for the consequences of its own unwise policies. And in certain emergencies there is just enough truth in the need for subsidies and controls to make the demand for them seem plausible.

But the same people who are persuaded to demand food subsidies, price and rent controls, do not want increased taxes or credit and wage controls. But subsidies come out of taxes and the way the administration handles them, they barely increase production or lower prices. Credit controls curb the people's spending and the people do not like them. Yet credit control is absolutely necessary to curb inflation. Moreover, Government cannot embark upon a program of controls without including wage controls. Wages are the largest element in the price of goods, and if they are not controlled, prices must rise. Industry can absorb some of the rise in costs from increased wages by increasing the volume of production and lowering profit margins. But there is a limit to increasing production and if every cent of profit were taken, it could not begin to offset the wage increases.

Consequently, industry must pass some of the increased costs on to the public in the form of higher prices. A vicious cycle sets in by which wages are left free to rise, resulting in higher prices, which in turn leads to demands for higher wages, and so on. The effect spreads all through the economic system. Those who cannot get upward wage and income adjustments fast enough—like teachers and people living on savings, insurance and pensions—are hit the hardest.

Ceilings on prices cannot stop inflation any more than putting a ceiling of 98.5 degrees on a thermometer can stop a fever. Controls in an economic system suffering from Government spending and inflation are like holding the lid down on a steaming pot while the fire underneath increases. They create dangerous maladjustments in the system which adversely affect many groups of individuals and disrupt the working of the system. They encourage Government favoritism. They inevitably lead to black markets which are just as inequitable as inflation and more vicious. In time, production itself breaks down because ceiling prices take the incentive out of enterprise. And as conditions go from bad to worse, Government is forced to extend and to tighten its controls until Government itself becomes vicious and oppressive. This has been the effect of Government controls in every country whenever in history they were imposed. We experienced a taste of it in 1946.

In emergencies like war, controls are necessary and they work after a fashion because the patriotic fervor of the people supports them. There is no such public support in peacetime and for a very good reason: controls are incompatible with the people's liberties and freedom.

Your letter asks what I and other Republicans are doing about inflationary conditions. In the first place, Republicans are not in control of Congress and there is no Republican administration in the White House and executive branches of the Government. This limits what Republicans can do because they have no power to pass legislation and they have no say in administration policies. Democrats exercise all this control. Your question should really be directed to them because they are responsible for existing conditions. If your home is not managed well, it would be unfair to put the blame on your neighbor or ask what he intends to do about it.

A political party is somewhat different though, because it has a responsible public duty to perform. In the role of opposition

party without power, it is the duty of Republicans to critically appraise the promises and performances of the Democrat administration which is in power; to call the Democrat administration to account whenever it fails in discharging the public trust; to expose mistakes and actions harmful to the public interest; and to offer constructive suggestions for the solution of public problems.

As one Senator of the opposition, I have done every one of these things in Congressional committees on which I serve, in debate on the Senate floor, in interviews to the press, over the radio and TV, and in public addresses throughout the country. While it is most unpopular to do so, I have taken the lead in exposing waste, criticizing Government's padded budgets, and taking active steps to enforce economy in spending. I have offered countless suggestions on how to handle the public business at less cost and more efficiently.

Others of my party have done likewise. The record is far too long and detailed to restate here. This letter is long enough as it is. No single, simple solution can cure the pains which the national interest now suffers from unwise and irresponsible Government policies.

The Republican Party as a whole offers the philosophy, the principles, and competent men of honesty and integrity who would systematically reduce Government spending, eliminate waste and corruption, balance Government income with outgo without sacrificing the real welfare of our people, lower taxes, reduce the size of the Federal Government and its heavy impact upon the lives of all our people. We have done more than promise better government. We have demonstrated it.

Since 1933, the Democrats have had a majority in Congress during 17 years, and the Republicans have had a majority only in 1947-48. For 16 out of the 17 years Democrats were in control of Congress, the Government was operated in the red. Taxes were pushed up for everyone and millions who never had to pay taxes were added to the rolls. When the Democrats took over in 1933, the Government was spending just under five billions a year for everything. The current budget will be close to eighty-one billions! The national debt in 1933 was twenty-three billions; today it is two hundred and fifty-seven billions. Is there any wonder that the value of your dollar has shrunk to 54 cents? Production doubled in 20 years, but the money supply forced up by the Government has increased five times. More dollars compared to goods make inflation inescapable.

During the 2 years Republicans were in control of Congress, the budget was balanced (with a huge surplus which President Truman now adds to his laurels as he did in dedicating the new Accounting Office building recently). Taxes were lowered and the public debt was reduced. Inflation was arrested and prices in 1947 and 1948 began to fall to reasonable proportions. The Eightieth Congress did this over the stubborn resistance of the President and his executive departments.

The Republican remedy was very simple but absolutely fundamental. They cut government expense. Government spending was cut from \$61,000,000,000 in 1946 to thirty-four billions in 1948. They applied the same common sense remedy you would have to use in your family finances if you found yourself spending more than you took in. If individuals do that too long, their credit is ruined and bankruptcy follows. Governments do not go bankrupt. They destroy the integrity of the currency (inflation); they may be forced to repudiate their debts (Government bonds); and they may be forced to put Government into business (socialism) because

unwise policies discourage private persons from producing.

I do not know whether this discussion convinces you or not, but it is the way I see things and the beliefs I hold. I have written at length to you because you are the kind of person the country must depend upon to make Government trustworthy and responsible for the public welfare. I regret to say that in my opinion, we do not have such government under the present administration.

Yours sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator, Michigan.

GOLD THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish now to pay a few words of tribute to one of the elder statesmen. On October 15, a noteworthy, if not historic, event took place on the floor of the Senate. On that date my distinguished colleague, and good friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made the statement that gold is the only acceptable international currency. For many years Senators from the Western States have maintained that silver was also an acceptable international currency, and I am happy now to hear that the most distinguished leader of the silver Senators has finally realized that gold is the only acceptable international currency. I now look forward confidently to the support of the Senator from Nevada in my efforts to repeal the silver purchase laws, thus removing the pretense that silver is acceptable on a par with gold as money.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 320) to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5215. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY (S. DOC. NO. 87)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal said in the Senate and elsewhere relating to bipartisanism in our foreign policy, or the lack of it. I have given considerable thought and study to this subject. Recently I have had prepared for me a study on

bipartisan foreign policy activities over the past few years. Because I feel it is a valuable document, and would be of interest to all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 210. An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates; and

S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on S. 913, the joint Budget Committee bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPEL

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senator McCLELLAN's budget bill, S. 913, I wish to say a few words in support of that proposal which was the unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I urge strong Senate support for this very important proposal so as to increase the chances of favorable action in the other House.

Mr. President, there are many praiseworthy aspects of this basic proposal but I shall take time to speak on only two of them. The first big advantage of S. 913 in my book is that the bill brings to bear for all Members of the Congress, something like the immense reservoir of talent, knowledge, and experience which are available to the executive branch for its work on budget and spending proposals. As the title of S. 913 states, its purpose is to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, it is high time that we provide ourselves with the absolutely necessary professional staff to assist us in meeting our responsibilities. All too frequently, busy Members of this Senate do not have the time, the aptitudes, the special training, or the experience to formulate even intelligent questions to ask the experts from the executive branch who defend the spending proposals on which we must act.

Moreover, those experts cannot be expected to volunteer any help or knowledge which is not directly in accord with a proposed appropriation bill as submitted to us. Such an appropriation bill may have been cut severely by the President of the United States, with perfect propriety, in fitting any

given program into the program of the Government as a whole. When that occurs, the official concerned must, of course, remain loyal to his chief, and must subsequently plead for only the program and the dollar amounts which the President has seen fit to allow him.

But, Mr. President, the Congress is under no such obligation to agree with the views of the President of the United States as to what the country needs in this or that field of Federal activity. In fact, if we do not agree, we have both the duty and the responsibility of modifying appropriation bills accordingly, either up or down. This readjustment of many, many budget items, some very technical indeed, cannot, however, be done properly under present conditions. We need adequate professional staff, preferably on a joint basis to serve both Houses, without waste and extravagance, as provided in S. 913.

Mr. President, I turn now to the second of the two points to which I am restricting myself in this brief discussion of the advantages of S. 913. I refer to the provision of the bill which I proposed as an amendment to Senator McCLELLAN's original bill, S. 913, and which, to my great personal satisfaction, was adopted by the full Senate Expenditures Committee. That amendment requires that, whenever standing committees in either House render reports on bills calling for future appropriations, they must include in those committee reports dollar estimates of anticipated new costs over the next 5 years.

In addition, S. 913, as reported, includes the further good provision that, at least annually, the joint budget committee must report on total estimated costs for the same years on all the proposals in this category which have been enacted by the Congress. In other words, not only are cost estimates to be available for each proposal reported by a committee, but in addition periodic summaries are to be made available of costs under all of such proposals which have been enacted by the Congress.

This cost-estimate idea is not new with me, Mr. President. It is substantially the same as was included in two resolutions introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, first session—both favorably reported by the Senate. One of these was Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, introduced by Senators FERGUSON, BRIDGES, and BYRD.

The other was Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, introduced by Senator WHERRY, plus the three Senators I have just mentioned, plus four additional Senators, namely, Senators BUTLER, REED, SALTONSTALL, and YOUNG. The former proposal related to cost estimates alone, whereas the latter merged it with other additional provisions.

Mr. President, I vigorously support this cost-estimate idea because of my belief that one of the basic reasons why we now stagger under such a tremendous Federal budget is because good-naturedly the various committees of the Congress, and then the Congress as a whole, have all too frequently gone along with a new and otherwise attractive program under the specious plea that it would cost little or nothing. Perhaps any single new authorization has not involved too great immediate payments. But taken together, they have helped materially to pile up a financial load that threatens to break the backs of the American taxpayer.

It is high time that all legislators be put on notice, Mr. President, whenever new programs are under consideration which pile up mandatory costs which future Congresses cannot avoid. That valuable notice is contained in S. 913. Of course, the warning may still be disregarded but if we do so, our voters back home have the information to hold us responsible.

Mr. President, there are other valuable features of this bill but I do not have the time to discuss them at this time. I close with expressions of my deep personal appre-

ciation to Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with whom I have had the privilege of serving. He has given generously and patriotically of his time and effort in a truly cooperative consideration and modification of this bill by all members of the Senate Expenditures Committee regardless of party. S. 913, beyond question, helps to put our fiscal house in order, and to keep it in order, as we meet the challenge of the greatly increased services of modern government, and as we assume immense new military burdens to meet the deadly Communist menace.

THE WORK OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which commends the members of my committee and deals with some of the work that has been done by the committee this year. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD as if I had made it on the floor of the Senate. I make the request so that I will not take up the time of the Senate by reading it. Therefore, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The time of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress has been almost equally divided between postal matters and legislation affecting the Civil Service Commission and the employees of the Federal Government other than postal employees.

One hundred and seventeen Senate bills, three House bills, five joint resolutions, and six resolutions were referred to this committee during the first session.

Hearings were held on a great portion of these measures and serious study and consideration were given to all. I believe that the outstanding record this committee has compiled during this first session of the Eighty-second Congress is well known to all and I desire at this time to give credit where credit is due.

The Post Office Subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Kentucky, Senator UNDERWOOD, is chairman gave consideration to 51 bills and 3 resolutions affecting the postal service.

Serving with Senator UNDERWOOD on this most important committee having jurisdiction over one of the largest agencies of any government in the world were the junior Senator from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, and Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island. This committee reported to the Senate 12 major and important bills. Of course, the greater portion of the time of this subcommittee was spent in the consideration of S. 355, the bill to readjust postal salaries which was finally approved by Congress on Friday of this week and is now on the President's desk awaiting his signature. This committee worked long and hard in the consideration of this bill to work out the many details in this legislation. This subcommittee and the committee as a whole were in complete agreement that it was nothing more than simple justice to adjust the salaries of the approximately 500,000 postal employees from the postmaster in the largest office to those in the smallest office of the fourth class and all employees in the automatic grades.

The committee as a whole considered the postal rate bill, S. 1046, and reported to the Senate what we considered a just and equitable bill that would wipe out much of the

Post Office Department deficit. I regret that the views of the Senate conferees and the members of my committee did not prevail and that a bill was not finally enacted to increase the postal revenue approximately \$400,000,000 so as to appreciably reduce the post office deficit.

I am particularly glad that the conferees agreed to retain in the rate bill the Carlson amendment setting up a joint committee of both Houses to study carefully all questions relating to postal rates. This is a rich field for constructive work and should result in a more equitable distribution of postal rates in the future and a better understanding on the part of the Congress as to the true picture with respect to the postal deficit. It is the opinion of my committee that such a joint operation is the only solution to the postal rate problem. As I said on the floor Friday of this week, the trouble in the past has been that the two Houses through their respective committees have held hearings and made studies as to postal rates and have always found themselves too far apart when the time comes for final action.

During the first session of this Congress 1,325 nominations for postmasters were referred to the committee for confirmation. After careful consideration of each nomination 1,177 were reported to the Senate, recommending approval—12 were withdrawn and 136 remain on the committee calendar due to the fact that the two Senators in the respective States have not approved such nominations.

The Civil Service Subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], is chairman has been one of the busiest of this or any other Congress. Serving with the able Senator from Rhode Island were Senators MONROE and BUTLER of Maryland.

This subcommittee considered more than 40 bills and reported 20 to the full committee for appropriate action—at least 10 of these were finally enacted into law.

Included in this group were important and major legislation such as—

The Graduated Leave Act, approved by Congress yesterday.

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1951, adopted by Congress on Friday of this week.

The modified Hoover Commission proposal to decentralize the examining and recruitment procedures of the Civil Service Commission which passed the Senate Friday of this week and now awaits action in the House of Representatives.

The bill S. 354 now on the Senate calendar, a complete revision and adjustment of the many overtime laws now on the statute books affecting Federal employees.

These and many more bills which I will not discuss at this time testify to the hard and efficient work done by this subcommittee.

Another very important subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], while not as spectacular as the aforementioned, has put in many hours of hard work on retirement legislation.

Serving with the very able Senator from Florida are Senators DUFF and MONROE.

They have considered many retirement bills during this session, one of the most important being S. 995 which proposes to rewrite the present cumbersome and many times amended retirement law for Federal employees.

Their progress in this field has been somewhat impeded by the failure of the Civil Service Commission to cooperate fully, but we all feel that this is a major step, and that this proposed legislation should and will be reported to the Senate very shortly after the beginning of the second session, so that full consideration may be given to the merits

of this proposal here on the floor of the Senate.

I do not believe that any chairman of a committee has had at his right hand the services of a more able or conscientious group of Senators than the junior Senator from South Carolina has had during this session of Congress. I say this without reference to majority and minority. In our committee, political alignment is left at the door of the committee room, and without exception, the committee actions were harmonious in every respect and at least 90 percent of the actions taken by the committee were unanimous.

My very close friend the very able junior Senator from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, has worked very hard on each and every bill referred to the committee for consideration, and without his undivided attention and assistance on the postal rate bill, I doubt that we could have met this challenge with much success.

Senators LANGER, WELKER, BUTLER, DUFF, and BENNETT all deserve special commendation for their extremely important contributions to the success of this committee.

Mr. President, a great deal of false and misleading charges have been leveled at this committee by the citizens committee on the Hoover Commission reports and I desire at this time to set the RECORD straight. Some of these statements no doubt were made by those who had been misinformed, but I regret to say that indications are that many of the misleading statements have been made deliberately and even after correct information has been supplied.

The true facts with regard to the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission) are set out in the printed hearings of the bills introduced in the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses to implement these recommendations.

It will be recalled that the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission was effected by plan No. 5, and of the Post Office Department under reorganization plan 3, both enacted during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

During the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, following close cooperation between the post office committees of both Houses and between the committees and the Postmaster General and the Comptroller General, Public Law 712 was enacted to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department. This is in effect and has already proved a step forward in efficiency and decentralization of the postal service.

At the beginning of this session of Congress only three items contained in the original Hoover report affecting the postal service and only one affecting Federal personnel generally were left to be considered by the committee. Of these four recommendations, only two remain to be considered by the committee in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress. No. 1, that the postal service be decentralized into 15 regions under regional directors of post and district superintendents; No. 2, that the confirmation of postmasters by the Senate be abolished.

Recommendation No. 1 has met with strong objection on the part of the Postmaster General, who has approved most of the other recommendations of the Hoover Commission. He has stated to the committee without qualification that recommendation No. 1 will positively result in no saving to the Post Office Department, but on the contrary would cost the Department at least \$5,000,000 annually to administer such a decentralization, without improving the service at all.

With respect to recommendation No. 2, the confirmation of postmasters has been

the subject of many a false blast from the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report. Representatives of this Citizens Committee have appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on several different occasions and have been questioned at length by the members of the Senate committee regarding this proposal. This Citizens Committee has failed in every respect to support its charges that its recommendation would remove politics from the appointment of postmasters and that it would save the Government any money at all. As you well know, the present law enacted in 1938 and often referred to as the O'Mahoney Act, permits postmasters in the Presidential office to be selected in two ways: from an eligible list, generally three; the highest resulting from a competitive examination or resulting from a noncompetitive examination if the Post Office Department appointee has the necessary civil-service status as a postal employee. Both examinations are held by the Civil Service Commission. This would not be changed under the provisions of the pending bills, the only change being that hereafter the Postmaster General would personally make the appointment instead of the President, and there would be no review by the Senate of each nomination.

These, Mr. President, are the true facts as to the Hoover Commission recommendations. Many false statements have been made and probably will continue to be made, but I want the Members of this body to know that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not pigeonholed or ignored any of the recommendations of this Commission, many of which were very worth while and which have been enacted into law. When this Senate or any committee thereof ceases to have the right to make the final decision as to legislation but must be dictated to by this so-called Citizens Committee, our present form of Government is in danger.

THE RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article prepared by me dealing with the rural telephone program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Two years ago Congress enacted legislation to enable the extension and improvement of telephone service in the rural areas of our country.

Almost all of us were aware of the decline in telephone service on the farms of America. We were concerned over figures which showed fewer farm telephones in use in 1945 than in 1920. We found that much less than half of our farm families had any kind of telephone service and that much of this was obsolete and unreliable. This was a condition that seriously impeded farming operations and posed a continuing threat to the security of our rural families.

Fifteen years earlier we had grappled with a somewhat analogous problem in rural electrification. To cope with the farmers' need for electric power we set up the Rural Electrification Administration, and year by year we watched its operations as it loaned money and offered technical advice to locally owned and locally controlled groups of rural citizens who undertook the job of bringing electricity to the farms and to small rural industries. The pattern was tested and proven. Now about 85 percent of our farms have electric power, and the repayment on the Government loans is one of the finest records to be found anywhere.

We used this same tested pattern in designing legislation to help rural people to have good telephone service.

The telephone loan program has made a good start in the brief time since its establishment. With very limited increase in REA's administrative budget and with the addition of a small number of telephone engineers and telephony specialists, the agency has been able to shoulder the new assignment.

The difficult task of organizing and setting up procedures for a new program has been accomplished. This done, the telephone program is now beginning to move ahead in high gear. Already telephone bells are sounding in farm homes where the phone never rang before, and antiquated crank sets are giving way to modern dial equipment.

Much hard work looms ahead for the coming months and years, for the job of bringing modern telephones to the far corners of rural America is only beginning and the task is formidable. The telephone program today is in about the same position that the rural electrification program was in its early days.

Now, as then, we have given REA a mandate to help farm people provide for themselves an essential service which large numbers of rural people had been unable to obtain without such help. Now, as then, REA is challenged to help local farm groups supply this service at reasonable rates throughout sparsely settled areas in which private capital has not seen sufficient profit opportunities to be persuaded to invest.

And now that the telephone loan program is gaining momentum after its initial organizing period, opposition is already being developed by some of the very people who failed to do the job of providing adequate rural telephone service. Charges are being made that REA proposes to socialize the telephone industry—the same baseless charges that were sounded against the rural electrification program when it first showed unmistakable signs of succeeding.

Amid all the shouting about socialization, there are contradictory complaints that the REA telephone program has accomplished nothing while costing the taxpayer great sums of money. It is significant that both of these conflicting charges—of doing nothing, on the one hand, and of threatening to take over the telephone industry, on the other—originate from the same source. That is, from a small and very short-sighted segment of the telephone industry. It comes largely from a few companies that have refused to extend service at reasonable rates to families in sparsely settled communities, yet object in dog-in-the-manger fashion to seeing rural people provide good telephone service for themselves with the aid of low-cost financing. At this point I want to make it very clear that I am not speaking of the many small independent companies who welcome the opportunity which the REA loan program is giving them to improve and expand their service—an opportunity, I might add, which had not been forthcoming from the resources of private financing organizations.

Talk of a drain on the taxpayer to subsidize rural telephones is without foundation. As in the rural electrification program, telephone loans must be repaid with interest in a maximum of 35 years. This means that no loan can be made without ample assurance that the enterprise is economically sound and that the Government will be paid back in full. As an added safeguard, REA requires telephone borrowers to put up an equity from 10 to 50 percent of the value of the completed system.

In making sure that the telephone program will not cost the taxpayer money—and that all loan funds will be returned to the United States Treasury—REA has moved cautiously in making its loans, conforming to the careful loan procedures employed generally by responsible lending organizations.

REA's record of loan repayments by rural electric borrowers has always seemed to me

a phenomenal success. I know of no credit agency, public or private, that has equaled it. Up to the end of September REA has collected \$310,258,000 including payments on principal in advance of due dates totaling about \$35,000,000. Less than one-quarter of 1 percent of payments are overdue more than 30 days. This splendid record is cogent evidence that the rural telephone loans will also be repaid without loss to the Government.

The cost of the telephone-loan program, then, is the relatively small appropriation for REA's administrative expenses. And this expenditure is more than justified as an investment in rural development and social welfare, which will benefit the whole Nation.

What about the charge that the telephone program has accomplished nothing?

By mid October REA had made telephone loan allocations totaling about \$48,800,000 to more than 133 borrowers. The loans will enable them to build or improve almost 43,000 miles of pole line bringing up-to-date telephone service for the first time to 92,000 new subscribers and improved service to 83,000 existing subscribers.

By the first week of September 84 borrowers under the REA telephone program had selected engineers. Forty of these had submitted area-coverage designs to REA for approval, and more than half of these designs had been approved. Seventeen were all ready to go their central office equipment. By the end of September actual advances totaling over a million dollars had been made to 17 borrowers.

A few of these companies already have telephones connected; many more will be connected during the favorable fall construction weather.

This to my mind is substantial progress for less than 2 years. This progress is the more significant considered in light of the fact that not only did the REA telephone program have to set up shop before it could begin making loans—but also that the work of administering the telephone loans was done by a very small staff. This already limited staff has recently been reduced of decreased appropriations to the point where progress of the program may be impaired.

The recent increase in the volume and venom of attacks upon REA is actually a testimonial to the progress of the rural-telephone program, though such is furthest from the intent of the instigators of the campaign. Those who went through the struggle to get low cost electric service on the outlying farms of America will remember that the power companies at first said it could not be done, then promised to cooperate with REA, while still shaking their heads over the impracticability of the plan. This period of skeptical well-wishing was quickly succeeded by cries of socialism and waste of public moneys. Years characterized by the building of spite lines and a concerted campaign to enact restrictive legislation in State assemblies or to bog down rural-electrification projects by subjecting them to unnecessary delaying, and often unfriendly commission jurisdiction followed. These road blocks to progress in rural electrification were all plausibly endorsed by selfish power interests in the name of free enterprise, and reduction of Government spending.

Fortunately rural people of the thirties knew what they wanted and refused to be stopped short of their goal by specious arguments or underhand maneuvers. It is no accident that today about 85 percent of the farms of America have central station electric service as compared to a little more than 10 percent in 1935 when REA was established.

Now the telephone program is moving into a similar phase of attack. In some States, small independent companies or co-ops that apply for telephone loans have suddenly been approached with offers of private financing.

Sometimes the offers are made by the same companies that had previously turned down the applicant. But now the financing is proffered with warnings that if the applicant borrows from REA he will be saddled with gold-plated construction requirements, fancy engineering fees, and Government interference in his business.

The attack takes many forms, but the intent is the same—to stop the program. In one instance a group of small mutuals decided to consolidate and get a telephone loan. They came to this decision after a large neighboring commercial company informed them that it could no longer continue to give them switching service unless the mutuals converted to dial at their own expense. Under the company proposal, each subscriber would be required to invest about \$175. So the mutuals applied to REA for a loan. When REA made a loan allocation to enable the co-op to develop its own up-to-date system—but not until then—the commercial company approached the individual mutuals and offered to buy them out and supply their members with modern telephone service without added construction costs. One of the mutuals succumbed to the offer. This forced the others to follow along, as the remaining group was too small to support a modern dial system on a sound economic basis. As a result, the REA loan application was reluctantly canceled by the mutuals. Just the same, it is as clear as a sunny day that the REA telephone program brought modern telephone service to the subscribers on those mutual lines. Even here you can chalk up real accomplishment by the REA loan program, though it does not show up on the loan records.

In States where farm leaders have introduced legislation with a view to making it easier for cooperatives to qualify for an REA telephone loan, enemies of the program have been active in trying to defeat such measures. Where they have failed, they have sought to add restrictive amendments calculated to hamstring the program. In one State a model law was passed only to be vetoed by the governor in the closing days of the legislature with a stinging charge of attempted socialization.

All these activities are calculated to delay and impede the telephone loan program and to spread doubt and confusion. If they succeed, the rural telephone program will indeed bog down.

I, for one, do not believe this sabotage of the program will succeed; but it would be foolish to underestimate the strength and ruthlessness of the attacks.

Rural families who want and need and rightly should have telephone service comparable to that enjoyed by city people should be on the alert against unscrupulous onslaughts on the REA telephone loan program. If they are wise, they will examine the motives of those who make the charges and ascertain the true facts. They will not passively view from the sidelines the attack on the program that has brought them electric power and will make it possible for them to have modern telephone service. They will recognize the campaign for what it is—an attempt to make the little fellow dependent for telephones on the big companies and financing concerns which have failed to serve him in the past. They will recognize the attempt and fight it. Owners of independent companies who are sincerely trying to expand and improve their service to meet the needs of farm areas in their territory are paying little attention to warnings against the rural telephone program. They, too, must be on guard, for the REA program is designed to help them, not to compete. The REA does not own a mile of line or even a single pole.

The farmer well knows that his electric co-op is not socialism—but democracy at the grassroots of America. From his own

experience he can refute claims that the REA telephone loan program is calculated to socialize the telephone industry. He has no cause to be afraid to speak out for what he knows to be a sound program, though its enemies try to pin a Socialist label on it.

Those who are trying to scuttle the telephone program charge that REA standards are too high—they call them gold plated. But these standards were adopted after consultation with experts in the private telephone industry, and over a period of time the better construction will effect savings in maintenance costs which will prove cheaper in the end and eventually make lower rates possible than would so-called cheap construction. Even on the score of original investment, REA specifications have in many instances been able to effect a savings as compared to industry costs.

REA is continually on the alert to find and test out promising possibilities for cutting costs of providing dependable telephone service in sparsely settled areas while maintaining high standards.

Early in May, for example, REA installed two channels of an experimental subscriber carrier system in the plant of Gulf Service Telephone Co. at Foley in my own State of Alabama. Results to date have been promising. Soon an experimental radio link will also be installed. If this electronic equipment proves as useful as expected in coping with the particular problems to which it is being adapted, then it can be recommended by REA to other borrowers with similar needs. But, as a guardian of public funds, REA is obligated to ascertain that any proposed construction economies are real economies before it can conscientiously recommend their use in Government-financed telephone systems.

The materials situation is another problem of concern to many REA borrowers. Generally speaking, materials are scarce and prices high. But the situation varies with different projects, locations, and suppliers and can improve or deteriorate quickly. For example, some have been told they could expect delivery on inside plant equipment in 200 days, but others have been informed that the wait would be as much as a year.

Determined and systematic effort on the part of local people is required in order to qualify for a rural telephone loan to provide new or improved telephone service. I am convinced that REA is making every effort to simplify loan procedures to make it as easy as possible for borrowers to comply with them. But the primary responsibility for meeting loan requirements necessarily rests with the borrower.

In spite of the considerable time and work involved in meeting loan requirements, applicants who have already seen their loan applications through to the point where they are about ready to start construction are looking ahead with enthusiasm. Where new telephones have actually been installed, many families who had not signed up originally as subscribers began asking for service. A case in point is the experience of the Fredericksburg & Wilderness Telephone Co. of Chancellor, Va. After this company switched over to dial, the demand for telephones shot up far beyond the most hopeful estimates of the management.

Yes, American farmers are really serious about wanting telephone service they can depend on to speed up their business operations and bring them closer to their neighbors, to their doctor, trading center, and church. They need good telephones more than ever because of the defense emergency which calls for top production in the face of labor shortages and mechanical breakdowns.

The large number of telephone loan applications pouring into REA proves how serious farmers are about wanting telephones. By the middle of October, REA had on hand

518 applications from 39 States and Alaska, asking for loans totaling \$82,426,377.

Undoubtedly some of these applications are for proposed systems which are not economically feasible or for other reasons cannot measure up to loan requirements as set up by REA in conformity with the telephone amendment to the Rural Electrification Act. But in any case, the volume of applications exceeds many times the funds currently made available by this Congress for telephone loans. Certainly the great number of applications is significant as a measure of the desire and need of farmers for telephones.

In view of this need and the record of the REA program in farm electrification, I foresee the day when the great majority of farm families will have dependable telephones—along with the good electric service they have today.

USE OF INCOME FROM TIDELANDS OIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement prepared by me entitled "Oil For the Lamps of Learning." It deals with the amendment, sponsored by 18 Members of the Senate to the so-called tidelands bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OIL FOR THE LAMPS OF LEARNING

My purpose in addressing the Senate today is to defend a priceless and incalculable national heritage against a determined effort upon the part of a dissatisfied minority of the States to snatch that heritage from the American people. I refer, of course, to the miscalled, misnamed and misrepresented tidelands bill which, whatever its pretended objective, is designed to make a forty billion dollar gift from the people of the United States to the three States of California, Louisiana, and Texas.

The bill, which has passed the House of Representatives, H. R. 4484, and is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is claimed by its sponsors to be variously a tidelands bill, a quitclaim bill and a bill to restore the historic rights of the States. I shall demonstrate to the Senate today, that H. R. 4484 is none of the things which its sponsors claim it to be. It is a give-away bill which permits a few States with the help of big oil companies to grab from the people of the United States the inestimable oil resources of the marginal sea—and even beyond this, to stick their fingers in the untold wealth of the great Continental Shelf.

It would give me great personal pleasure, in ordinary circumstances, to support the enactment of any legislation which would be of particular benefit to the people of California, Louisiana, or Texas. But we are dealing here with an issue which is more important than any single State, more important than any single industry, more important than any special or local or private interest. We are dealing with a great national asset, declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to belong to the people of the United States: An asset which may prove essential to our national economic well-being in time of peace and vital to our common defense against threatened aggression; indeed, indispensable to our very national existence in time of war.

The oil resources of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf are too great to be dealt with as the plaything of a political game or the pawn of a financial grab.

In an earlier speech in the Senate I pointed out that the ablest petroleum geologists in the oil industry, including the Geological Survey of the United States Department of the Interior, estimate the off-

shore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15,000,000,000 barrels. More than a year ago Dr. E. O. Dooly, of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists in the world—if not the outstanding—stated in *Life* magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana alone. At present prices these 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth over \$40,000,000,000.

In addition to the huge reserves of under-sea oil off the coasts of California, Texas and Louisiana estimates published by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association say there are also fabulous quantities of gas. According to a bulletin of last December, published jointly by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association, estimates of proven gas reserves off the coasts of these three States total a little over 140 trillion cubic feet of gas. The commercial unit of gas measurement is 1,000 cubic feet—called an M. c. f. This would place the gas reserves at 140 billion M. c. f. The price of gas per M. c. f. varies a little in different areas but if we take 7 cents per M. c. f. as a fair figure for the purpose of arriving at the value of the gas reserves and multiply it by the 140 billion M. c. f., we find that the gas is worth almost \$10,000,000,000.

We have seen the pressures that have been exerted, the false fronts that have been constructed. We have seen the parade of scarecrows that has been led up and down the aisles and in and out of the committee rooms of both Houses of Congress. Despite the false fronts, despite the specious arguments, despite the political pressures, I do not believe that the United States Senate is willing to assume the responsibility of giving away \$40,000,000,000 worth of the people's property. Indeed, I do not believe that the House of Representatives, which has already passed this legislation, will be willing on the final showdown to assume such a responsibility.

Today it is my purpose to analyze the legislation which has already passed the House of Representatives, H. R. 4484, and to strip from it the false labels intended to conceal this unprecedented proposal for give-away and grab. Some of these labels are designed to frighten the American people and the American Congress. Others are designed to lull them into a desired sense of serenity as to what the legislation proposes to do. Let us, therefore, take a look at the record and see just what the sponsors of this bill propose to do with the Nation's offshore oil reserves.

In the first place, the very name by which the bill has been tagged is a spurious name. It has been called a tidelands bill. The fact is that the bill has nothing whatever to do with the tidelands, just as the litigation which preceded it had nothing to do with the tidelands. The tidelands, properly called, are the lands around the coast which lie between the high-water mark and the low-water mark of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. The Federal Government has never asserted the slightest claim to the ownership or dominion over the tidelands or the oil or other minerals which may lie beneath them. For more than a century the Supreme Court of the United States has held, and in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases this holding has been reaffirmed, that the States—here I quote the Court of the California case—are seized of "ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark." This determination was made originally by the Supreme Court at a very early period in our history. It was specifically held by the Supreme Court in the Pollard case involving my own State of Alabama that the Federal

Government has no right of ownership in the tidelands.

The whole question of a threatened Federal claim to ownership of the tidelands, lands under the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and other navigable waters lying inside the low-water mark of the sea, is a bugaboo designed to get the backing of the other 45 States behind the 3 States which seek to have the Federal Government give them \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil.

The tidelands and other inland navigable waters are definitely not involved in this controversy. What is here involved and what was involved in the three historic cases of *United States v. California*, *United States v. Texas*, and *United States v. Louisiana* was the ownership of the rich oil lands lying under the marginal seas—that is, lying beyond the low-water mark out to the 3-mile limit. These lands are constantly under the waters of the sea and their ownership had never been adjudicated prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in these cases that followed the discovery of oil, a few years ago. The three States involved asserted that they were the owners of the oil, while on the other hand the Attorney General contended that the Federal Government was the owner. The Attorney General's contention was upheld by the Supreme Court in each of the three cases.

The purpose of the give-away bill is to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions and to give away the oil which lies under the marginal sea. Title III of the give-away bill goes even beyond the marginal sea and proposes to give to the States an interest in the royalties derived from oil in the Continental Shelf—that is, the submerged lands of the American Continent which lie beyond the 3-mile limit. Title III of the give-away bill deals with a proposition which was never considered by the Supreme Court in any of the three cases to which I have referred and goes far beyond the most fantastic claims ever made by the proponents of State ownership or State control.

So I again emphasize this is not a tidelands bill. This is a bill to give away the Nation's oil under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf.

This give-away legislation, H. R. 4484, has also been misnamed a "quitclaim bill." Now, those of my colleagues who are lawyers will clearly realize what a false label this is. If my neighbor and I both claim a certain strip of ground that falls within the boundaries of our respective properties, we may wish to settle the matter without litigation. Each of us may have been advised by his lawyer that he has a good title to the property in question. One of us must be wrong. Each of us thinks he is right, but in the absence of some court decision, neither of us can be sure which is right. Under these circumstances, it might be desirable for us to compromise the matter rather than to incur the expense, the delay, and the bad feeling incident to a lawsuit. If that is the way my neighbor and I feel about the controversy, it would be natural for one of us to pay the other a sum of money, in return for which the rival claimant would abandon his claim and put an end to the controversy. If we resorted to that procedure, then one of us would give a quitclaim deed to the other relinquishing all claims to the disputed property.

If, Mr. President, there had never been any litigation between Texas, California, and Louisiana and the Federal Government; if there had never been a judicial determination as to the ownership of the oil lying under the marginal sea—if these things had never happened, then it might be proper to talk about a quitclaim bill. But all questions of claim have been settled. There has been litigation, and there has been a solemn determination of all the issues by the highest judicial tribunal known to our constitu-

tional system, the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, after the suits have been brought, the briefs submitted, the arguments made, and the cases decided—how, Mr. President, can there be any serious talk about quitclaims to \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil? The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently held that this oil belongs not to the States but to the Nation. There is no controversy to be settled, nothing to be quitclaimed.

If my neighbor and I, instead of compromising our differences had gone to law and if the courts had decided that the property in dispute belonged to me and not to my neighbor, then there would be no question of my quitclaiming anything. If my neighbor wanted the property, and if I were willing to sell it, perhaps he might buy it from me. Or, if I were sufficiently generous, I might even give it to him. But the newspaper, Labor, the organ of the Railway Brotherhoods, put the oil issue in a nutshell when it stated "\$40,000,000,000 is too much to give away."

Let us not fool ourselves with childish prattle about quitclaim and compromise. This is not truly a proposal to quitclaim anything or to compromise anything. It is a proposal for the people of the United States to make to three States the biggest gift in history.

The sponsors of this give-away legislation have referred to it as a bill to restore the historic rights of the States to the submerged lands underlying the marginal sea. As I have already pointed out, title III of H. R. 4484, reaches far beyond the marginal seas and I shall in this connection discuss it in a few moments at greater length. But even if this legislation were confined to handing over to the States just the oil underlying the marginal sea, it would still be incorrect to call it a bill to restore the historic rights of the States. No decision of the Supreme Court had ever held that this property belonged to the States, for the matter had never been litigated. While it may be true that the States claimed certain rights, or assumed certain rights, the Supreme Court, in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases, held that these claims and assumptions were not valid.

Sometimes, the proponents of this legislation talk of the historic rights of the States as if the States and their lessees had been drilling oil wells in the marginal seas for centuries. The fact is that it was only a few years ago that anyone suspected the existence of something to fight about. Then, when these three States and the Federal Government had reason to believe that valuable reserves of oil existed beneath the marginal seas, the controversy started to brew. Those who propose this give-away legislation cannot, by the skillful manipulation of words, bamboozle the Congress and the American people into accepting the proposition that because the States have made mistaken claims and mistaken assumptions as to the ownership of this oil the Nation is thereby obligated to hand them the greatest bonanza in history.

Now, Mr. President, that we have removed some of the false fronts and false labels from this give-away bill, I think it only fair that we should consider and analyze some of the arguments which have, in my opinion, been most unfairly advanced in support of the give-away proposal.

For example, it has been argued by men of great influence and for whom I have great admiration and respect that there is an element of socialism in the ownership by the Federal Government of these great oil resources which lie under the marginal seas and the Continental Shelf. With all possible respect to those who make this argument, my answer is that it is demonstrably absurd. From the very beginning the Federal Government has owned and con-

trolled the mineral resources of the public lands. I have never heard it argued, and I do not believe that it could be seriously argued, that the provisions of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act are socialistic. On the contrary, private business has operated and prospered under that law. The whole history of the Federal Government's policies and operations under the act is a repudiation of any contention that Federal dominion over a great national asset is a form of socialism. Socialism is no more or no less socialism because the particular government involved happens to be that of one State or that of all the States. The sole question involved in this controversy is whether these particular resources should remain the property of the Federal Government, which they are today, or whether they should be given to the three States. How can it be said that ownership of oil by the State of Texas, California, or Louisiana is private enterprise while the ownership of the oil by the Federal Government is socialism? In either case it is a governmental unit which owns and exercises dominion over the oil. In either case it is a private enterprise, operating under a lease from either the State or Federal Government, which will operate the business of producing, refining and selling the oil.

I do not propose at this time to enter into any detailed discussion as to the proper method of leasing these lands. That is not the question with which I am dealing. I am talking about the basic principle of private enterprise and I assert—indeed, I do not believe that any man who has studied the question even casually can reasonably deny—the only question involved is not whether private business shall withdraw the oil but rather under what conditions it shall be withdrawn by private business. On the one hand, the proponents of the give-away bill contend that it is socialistic for the Federal Government to retain its rights as adjudicated by the courts. On the other hand, the same proponents contend that there is somewhere a sinister plot on the part of private enterprise to obtain leases from the Federal Government under the Mineral Leasing Act. I submit in all fairness that they cannot have it both ways. Their whole argument stumbles over its own inconsistencies.

The whole issue of socialism is a phony issue—a goblin dressed up to frighten the American people into giving this oil to a few States which do not own it and to the particular private oil interests with which these States have allied themselves.

In fact, Mr. President, the entire argument advanced by the proponents of this give-away bill is a fantastic procession of goblins and ghosts.

Another one of these Halloween creations is the argument that the Federal Government is using or will seek to use its rights in the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf to invade the boundaries of the States and take away the inland waterways. I have already, in dealing with the manner in which this give-away proposal has been misnamed the tidelands bill, dealt with this specious argument to some degree. Without this particular bugbear it would have been impossible for the three States which seek the \$40,000,000,000 gift from the Federal Government to enlist under their banner so many of the officials, and particularly the attorneys general of various States, from which this give-away bill seeks to snatch away valuable rights and resources. The officials in such States have been led to believe that somehow there hangs over them a threat upon the part of the Federal Government to invade the boundaries of the States and take away their harbors, their bays, their docks, and the resources of their inland waterways.

This argument is so false and so misleading that only the subtle and well-financed

propaganda of skilled advocates could ever have sold such a bill of goods. In the first place, the Attorney General on behalf of the United States has repeatedly and specifically disclaimed any ownership by the Federal Government of the tidelands and the inland waterways. The Federal authorities have repeatedly and affirmatively declared that the States possess and have always possessed the ownership in the inland waterways and their resources and that the only power that the Federal Government may exercise is its constitutional authority respecting navigation and commerce on their waters. The declarations by the executive department of the Federal Government have been sustained and affirmed by the unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court up to and including the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. But the proponents of the give-away bill say that is not enough for them. And why is it not enough? Because this whole campaign to get their hands on the oil of the marginal sea is built on confusing the marginal-sea ownership with the ownership of the tidelands and inland waterways.

Their sincerity was put to the acid test in the House of Representatives when the give-away bill was under construction. At that time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] offered in the nature of a substitute legislation which would have had the Congress confirm by specific legislation the unchallenged title of the States to the resources of the tidelands and inland waterways. Those who want the give-away shouted down the offer.

So, I contend that not only is the issue of the inland waterways a bugbear, but this is a bugbear in which the proponents of the give-away bill do not even themselves believe.

Then, there is another one of these goblins I should like to discuss for a few moments. That is the argument that this legislation is necessary to thwart or frustrate a grab on the part of the Federal Government. Sometimes the proponents of the give-away bill are explicit about this and sometimes they are a little vague, but when their argument is analyzed it boils down to the proposition that the executive department of the Federal Government and the United States Supreme Court joined in a conspiracy to steal this \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil from California, Louisiana, and Texas for the Federal Government. While the proponents of the give-away bill are sometimes a little gingerly in their language, it is perfectly clear that when their guard is down what they have really intended is an attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, I am the last man in the world, certainly one of the last in the United States Senate, who should or would ever argue that our courts are beyond criticism, or that mistakes upon the part of the judiciary cannot be corrected by the Congress. This argument goes far beyond the question of conflicting legal viewpoints. It is, at least in its extreme manifestations, a little short of an attack upon the integrity and the competence of the United States Supreme Court.

The argument is too preposterous to mention except for the purpose of showing the extent to which the proponents of the give-away are willing to go to get their hooks on this fabulous store of oil.

We may agree or disagree with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Certainly in the past there have been decisions of that body with which I did not agree. I have not hesitated to criticize the decisions. At no time, however, have I ever questioned the integrity or devotion to duty of the Court and when those who seek a \$40,000,000,000 gift from the Federal Government attack a decision of the Supreme Court, the highest judicial body in the Nation, as a Federal grab, I regard it as a shocking assault upon the integrity of the judicial

process. A court exists to decide cases and in any decision somebody must lose.

Incidentally, the attack upon the Court is also an attack upon the Attorney General of the United States and the other Federal officials who defended the Government's ownership which was upheld by the Court.

I cannot refrain from mentioning the name of Mr. Justice Clark, who as Attorney General presented the Government's case so capably and effectively. No man loves the State of Texas more devotedly than her native son, Tom Clark, who has brought to her such credit and distinction. I am sure that it was painful to him—as indeed it is to me—to be found in opposition to her desires. But Tom Clark had a higher duty; his duty to his conscience and his oath; and he lived up to his duty, regardless of sentiment or personal attachment. I do not think that even the most vehement supporter of Texas' claims will be heard to say that Tom Clark would participate in a sordid grab at the expense of the State he loves.

Who, then is alleged to have instigated the grab? Mr. President, is not the guilt, if guilt there must be, chargeable to the Senate of the United States? The very issue now under consideration was squarely presented to this body on August 19, 1937—just 14 years ago. On that date, the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Joint Resolution 208, declaring that the oil resources of the marginal sea are asserted to be the property of the United States. The resolution further undertook to authorize and direct the Attorney General to institute legal proceedings for the purpose of establishing the rights of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I repeat that this joint resolution passed the Senate unanimously, without a dissenting voice.

Who will rise to say that the Senate in 1937 was instigating a Federal grab?

Indeed, Mr. President, if there is an element of grab, and I think there is, it is a grab not by the Federal Government but a grab to take away from the people of all 48 States that which the courts have determined belongs to them. It was not a grab upon the part of the Federal Government for the Supreme Court to determine that this oil was national property. It was an adjudication. Once an adjudication was made and the ownership of the oil determined, then it is a grab when those who do not own the oil seek to take it away from those who do own it. So I say that the question which today should concern the Congress and the American people is not how to give this oil away, but how to keep it and use it in the national interest. That is why, I, along with 17 other Members of the Senate have proposed legislation to dedicate this precious, priceless, irreplaceable national asset to the common defense and to the education of America's children.

In my discussion, Mr. President, I have attempted to dispose of the legal shams which pretend to prop up the rickety myth of justification behind H. R. 4484.

I turn now to two considerations of national policy which must impel the Congress to retain this offshore oil for the people of the United States. Both of these policy considerations are embodied in the so-called oil-for-education amendment which my colleagues and I have introduced.

I am pleased to say that the number of sponsors of the oil-for-education amendment has increased to 18. They are besides myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Benton], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Neely], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Missouri [Mr.

Hennings], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Gillette], the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Murray], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Langer], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Moody], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

The first consideration of national policy is our national security. Can anyone be unaware of what is taking place in Iran—the oil life line of half the world? Surely none are so simple as to imagine that Russia in her schemes and her overtures to the Iranian Government has any other purpose than to get her hands on the oil that she now lacks for her huge war machine.

While we still hope for a safe solution of the Iranian oil crisis, we would be faithless guardians for our people if we did not, as prudent men, act on the assumption that the oil of the Middle East might be lost to Western Europe and to us. In such case all free nations must look to this hemisphere. In such case our oil becomes not alone a national resource to be conserved and guarded for the future welfare of our children but a national resource which must be preserved by a watchful government, if our Nation is to survive.

A modern army travels not on its stomach but on oil. The Wehrmacht ground to a shuddering halt because of lack of oil. The American Air Force made its first great raids on the Axis against the Ploesti oil refineries in World War II and it kept up a steady attack until Hitler had no oil. The vaunted Luftwaffe and the Japanese Air Force—what was left of them—stayed on the ground because they had no oil. Oil is strategic target No. 1 for the very simple reason that if a nation does not have oil it has neither offense nor defense.

The Federal Government, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility for national defense, must at all costs conserve its oil for our defense.

Our first Secretary of Defense, the able and tragic James Forrestal, who understood so well that oil was the sinew of arms called the offshore oil "our most priceless possession." With his long background of experience as wartime Secretary of the Navy, he strongly opposed the giveaway bills which were the predecessors of the present H. R. 4484. If he were alive today—whether in public office or as a private citizen—I know his voice would be raised once again in warning that this oil must be preserved under Federal control.

The point I have just made has been made no better anywhere than in a recent editorial from the Atlanta Journal. It says:

"While all this focuses the attention of the world on oil from foreign countries, the Congress of the United States attempts to fritter away one of our greatest potential sources of oil right here at home."

"There is only one proper use for the offshore oil fields: That is, as a reserve for national defense to power the Army, Navy, and Air Force of this country if and when other sources are depleted."

"If we allow States and individual companies to chip away at this resource until it is lost, the time may come when we will have committed national suicide for lack of the fuel to maintain our Armed Forces."

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch," which has led the fight for national control of offshore oil, has stated the case unanswerably:

"Whether under the false cry of States Rights or the frank admission of private greed, no one must be allowed to exhaust today what may be indispensable to the Nation's existence tomorrow. Against any effort to put our fighting oil to any smaller purpose than the defense of the Nation, the only course is to fight."

Only the Federal Government can determine the defense needs for oil. Only the highest experts of the Army, the Navy, and

the Air Force in collaboration with the technicians of the Interior Department can weigh the fluctuating supply and demand of oil. They are the ones who must weigh the chances in Iran, they must determine how easily and how soon the great Middle East pipeline may be sabotaged, they must evaluate the availability of the tankers of the western allies, they must decide how much oil can safely be diverted from the Western Hemisphere to Western Europe, should Middle Eastern oil fall to Russia. This sort of thing cannot be done by State governments.

The oil-for-education amendment offers a two-edged weapon for national defense. During the present emergency the royalties from this offshore oil may be used for the urgent needs of national defense.

Once these needs are met, once the sinews and muscles of our war machine are sufficiently strong that Russia must prudently pause, it is our proposal that the royalties from this oil should then be used in all the States for educational purposes. For we cannot longer neglect the education of our children if we expect as a nation to remain intelligent enough to recognize international danger and to be able to preserve our freedom. As the United States Commissioner of Education, Hon. Earl James McGrath, said recently:

"Life does not stop while we build the Nation's military strength. Children are born and grow up. They go to school and to college. You cannot put a generation into educational cold storage and then later put them into an educational hothouse.

"The necessities of the long pull before us are not merely military essentials. There are equally basic essentials in nonmilitary areas. To provide the essentials in all areas is our continuing objective. Only thus can we meet the demands of the long pull which lie before us—a period in which the preparedness of the Nation must be at hitherto undreamed-of peacetime levels, which at the same time the basic essentials of life and growth must be provided for all our people, including all the children."

We face a future world where in terms of sheer quantitative manpower our children may be outweighed 4 or 5 to 1. It may be even 10 to 1 if the Soviet manages to consolidate the continent of Asia. And as we analyze why we have not already been overwhelmed by the totalitarian tide, the most fundamental answer is that we have had the foresight for over a century to invest more of our national wealth in the education of our children than any other nation.

I suggest that America's organizational and productive capacity—which is the root of our own security and is the last great hope of the free world today—is the direct result of two mighty American inspirations about education. The first of these inspirations was public support for free schools with good educational standards, first dreamed of and fought for by Thomas Jefferson and later accomplished in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Horace Mann, of Brown University, Rhode Island, and our second inspiration was the policy of dedicating revenues from our public lands to education.

Several months ago when we introduced the "oil for education" amendment on the floor of the Senate, I tried to indicate that this precious heritage of education for all our people was in danger of becoming a myth. At that time I cited the dilapidated condition of our schools, the huge increases in our child population, and the alarming exodus of our inadequately paid teachers from the teaching profession into better-paying pursuits.

Last month the Office of Education released its annual enrollment estimates. These new estimates point to the highest enrollment of students ever recorded—more than 33,000,000 elementary, high school, and college students. Elementary school enrollment jumped by nearly a million last year

as the wartime baby crop began to become of school age. A veritable tidal wave of 6-year-olds will hit the schools over the next 4 years. Ten thousand new elementary school teachers are required just to meet the swollen enrollment this year.

A. for the general school situation all we need to do is to state the increased enrollment figures. Once that is done the problems they reveal are frighteningly obvious. Once more let United States Commissioner of Education McGrath speak:

"Ninety-nine thousand new teachers will be needed to fill positions left vacant by retirement, resignation, or death during 1951-52.

"Additional numbers of children enrolled will require 21,600 teachers who did not teach last year.

"Of the 120,600 total, elementary schools will need 87,000 new teachers; high schools, 33,000.

"Expanded school enrollments in 1951-52 will call for 25,000 new classrooms. To replace obsolete facilities an additional 18,000 classrooms should be provided. One of every five schoolhouses now in use throughout the United States should be abandoned or extensively remodeled because they are fire hazards, obsolete or health risks."

Think of it—one of every five schoolhouses are today fire hazards, obsolete, or health risks.

Ever since the depression, and I remind you that was 20 years ago, school construction has failed to keep pace with the demand for classroom facilities. This had been true for three reasons—first, the depression years; second, the ban on construction during World War II; and, third, the awaited drop in building costs after the war did not occur, as we all know.

The result of this 20 years of delay is obvious today to every parent and teacher, to every State and local government, and, in fact, I do not believe there is any citizen who is unaware of it.

According to the recent annual report of Dr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association, the situation is incredibly bad. Dr. Givens says:

"At least a quarter of a million children are attending school only on a half-day basis, and many thousand others are attending school in basements, rented store buildings, and other quarters not suited for school purposes. The inadequate toilet facilities, faulty ventilation, dust-laden air, and uncontrolled noises that are found far too often in old, outmoded buildings still in use are a threat to the health of children."

The National Education Association's estimate of the need in the next 10-year period from 1950 to 1960 is that a half million new elementary- and secondary-school classrooms must be built. At present prices NEA estimated the cost at \$13,500,000,000.

Miss Selma Borchardt, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers in reporting upon the unanimous action of the federation in endorsing the oil-for-education amendment at its national convention last month declared that "the Nation's schools face their most severe crisis in our country's history." The federation emphasized the urgent need for Federal funds to aid American education in the crisis.

It has long been clear that many local communities which have in the past almost wholly borne this financial responsibility can no longer do so, even when they tax themselves to the limit.

But vastly more important than the bricks and mortar are the people who prepare our children with knowledge and teach them to think.

The school teacher is the central figure in the education process. We entrust the minds and the character of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours of the day. We look to the

teacher to mold the children for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood. Inevitably the character and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the entire Nation.

Yet we are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers. We have never given them the recognition, the appreciation, and the financial security they deserve. Poorly paid even before World War II, their situation is much worse today. Their earnings have not kept pace with earnings in general. Rising costs have forced thousands upon thousands of teachers from the classrooms out of financial necessity, and they are still leaving. The drain is greatest among our best trained teachers. Teachers with emergency certificates are becoming less the exception than the rule. Teacher-training colleges cannot even begin to meet the huge demands for teachers from the dwindling graduating classes as young people abandon their teaching ambition to economic necessity.

The only way to get the 80,000 teachers needed during the school year which started last month is to pay them adequately.

Now let me turn briefly to the situation in our colleges. Contrary to the trend in the elementary and high school—our colleges and universities have this fall suffered their second consecutive drop in enrollment. The New York Times reports the student loss this year at 250,000, a 10 percent drop from last year. Besides the draft and the drawing to a close of GI education programs, there is a third reason. Our birth rate in the depression years was, as is always true in depressions, quite low. The depression babies are now entering the colleges. Today, we have a situation in our colleges and universities that is just the opposite of what it will be a few years from now when the tremendous crop of war and postwar babies are ready for their training as our doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, chemists, and as leaders in other professions and businesses. When that period arrives we must have colleges ready to receive them. It is our duty to keep alive our facilities for college training. I am willing to agree that a certain amount of economizing in tight times is not only necessary but encourages efficiency in any institution, whether it be a college, a business or a government. But we must be most careful that we do not cripple vital functions. Colleges today train most of the people who will someday be our leaders.

All our colleges are having serious financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities, or the small college. The New York Times survey to which I referred shows that half our independent liberal arts institutions are operating in the red. The colleges that are hardest hit are the small colleges with enrollments under 500. They may be small colleges for women or city colleges without a campus. These are the kind that too often do not have the endowment of a large private college and, of course, do not have the tax support of the State institutions. But if you will look through Who's Who in America and pick at random the names of the men and women whom you regard as important on the national scene you will be surprised at how many received their educations in these small colleges. I invite you to look at the Congressional Directory and see how many of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress received their education in such institutions.

The large colleges are having serious difficulty in receiving funds from the sources which have supported them in the past as estate and inheritance taxes no longer make it possible for rich people to give large support to such institutions. The downward trend of college enrollment means that tuition, so often the backbone and the mainstay of so many of our higher institutions, is dwindling.

Yet a college is much more than bricks and mortar, ivy and campus. It is essentially the sense of tradition, the pride of excellent teaching over the years that distinguishes the good college from the mediocre one. Once again, I remind you that if this world stays in its present uneasy state our colleges and universities will have to have help if they are to survive and be able to support the war and post-war baby population which this September has overrun the first grade.

In 1930 we spent 3.1 percent of our national income for schools, including teachers' salaries. In 1951 this dropped to 2.5 percent. We should be able to do better than this. In 1939, for example, we spent \$2,289,000,000 for all public school costs. In the same year of 1939 we spent almost that much for tobacco; more than that by one-third for alcoholic beverages. That was more than a decade ago. Our performance today is even worse. In 1949 we spent \$5,000,000,000 on schools. In the same year of 1949 we spent \$8,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages; \$4,500,000,000 for tobacco, \$2,000,000,000 for amusements alone—three times as much for luxuries as we did for education.

Can we honestly say our pride in education, our respect for the teaching profession, our concern for our children are all we claim they are?

Mr. President, I have thus far devoted myself to an exposé of the false arguments espoused by the proponents of H. R. 4484 and I have tried to set forth for you the size of the educational problem which confronts these United States.

I now turn to an explanation of our "Oil for Education" amendment. While it, like other legislation, is not a panacea it will go far toward curing the financial crisis in today's education without placing a further burden on the back of the taxpayer. I should like to answer some of the questions on the purpose of this amendment which have been raised by other Senators and by educators, parents, teachers and citizens in every State in the Union. I report with pleasure, Mr. President, that I have been gratified at the great show of interest in this measure as reflected in my mail. I was well aware that the serious problems of education were weighing heavily on the minds and hearts as well as on the pocketbooks of our citizens. The mail that I am receiving shows how widespread and acute is this concern.

I want to emphasize again that the "Oil for Education" amendment proposes no new departure into uncharted seas. It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—a policy that was advocated and fought for by that far-sighted Massachusetts statesman, President and Member of Congress, John Quincy Adams.

That policy is the use of revenues from public lands for educational purposes.

From the earliest beginnings in colonial times many of the colonies earmarked public lands for the support of schools. The earliest case was in Virginia in 1618. Colleges started with the aid of land grants in the various colonies include Harvard in Massachusetts, William and Mary in Virginia, Yale in Connecticut, Princeton in New Jersey, and others in South Carolina and Georgia.

After the American Revolution we were faced with a situation which was similar in some respects to the present demands of the three coastal States for the national property in the submerged lands lying beyond the low-tide mark. Individual States laid claim to the territories west of the Appalachians. In 1780 the Congress passed a resolution containing a pledge that these western lands would be disposed of for the benefit of all States. In 1785 and 1787 ordinances were passed by the Congress which specifically set aside a portion of the public lands west of the mountains for school pur-

poses. In speaking of the ordinance of 1787, Daniel Webster declared:

"I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787. It set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education."

Many of the great State universities were started with the aid of the public lands dedicated to education by the ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In the next three-quarters of a century many additional laws were passed by the Congress setting aside Federal lands or the proceeds thereof for educational purposes in the several States. None of these laws were, however, as general in effect and as significant as the Morrill Act passed by Congress in 1862 and signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. This act granted to each State 30,000 acres of Federal land or land script for each Senator and Representative in the Congress to which the State was entitled for the establishment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanical arts. States in which there were no Federal public lands, or which did not contain sufficient amount of public land to satisfy the grant, were issued land script which could be sold by the State and redeemed by the purchasers of the script from public lands located in other States.

The land-grant colleges are an integral part of the public higher educational system in the South and West. It is possible that easterners have too easily forgotten that this support from the Federal Government is given to their most prized educational institutions too. Do we recall, for example, that the great Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Mass., which this Nation has long regarded as a pinnacle of engineering and scientific capacity and to which Washington turns when we need scientists to lead our scientific defense effort—is a beneficiary under the Morrill Act?

And the people of New York well know that Cornell University, at Ithaca, where my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] once taught, and which is a pioneer of scientific agriculture in this country, is a land-grant college receiving aid from the Federal Government through the Morrill Act.

After the land-grant colleges had become fairly established throughout the Nation with the assistance provided by the land grants under the Morrill Act, many of the States experienced difficulty in supporting these colleges. In a number of subsequent acts the Congress provided for the further endowment, support, and extension of the services of these institutions. Thus, from a far-sighted and intelligent use of a portion of the national domain there has arisen a system of great educational institutions upon which the higher education of a major portion of our population primarily depends. No one can estimate what this wise use of public-land resources for education has meant to the development and progress of the United States. Benefits accruing to the Nation from this fruitful and far-sighted policy of educational endowment has been great beyond measure. These institutions of learning have contributed importantly to the rise of the United States to its present position of strength and world leadership.

Public funds applied to free education for all at the primary and secondary level, together with public funds applied through land-grant college endowments at a higher level, have had the effect of piling up the reserves of generations of educated youngsters that give us the competence by which our Nation solves its productive problems

to a degree never approached by any other nation in all history.

For generation after generation these land-grant colleges have been turning out young men and women as top-flight engineers, farmers, doctors, teachers, and as leaders in many other essential professions and skills.

It is indeed no accident that a scientific idea originating anywhere in the world always finds its quickest practical application in the United States. That is because the seed generated by the genius of the world falls upon a cultivated ground of engineering know-how.

It is no accident—but is instead the accumulated payoff of generations of great agricultural teaching—that year after year, despite the vagaries of the weather, we have been producing bumper crop after bumper crop from seeds which originated in foreign countries. And we have used these crops not only to feed ourselves but to help a starving world all the way to India. No one, I may say, is more aware of this than our ECA administrators and point 4 program administrators.

You and I know that merely putting American machinery and American capital into even the highest foreign civilizations abroad will not produce anywhere near the same end result as that same machinery always produces here at home. The simple reason is that when the machinery arrives there is not available the skilled manpower to work it, and more importantly, the skilled know-how to maintain it.

We struggle constantly with the problem of how to raise the standard of living in the world. The Middle East is much in the news today. We have heard the stories of the returning travelers who tell of American agricultural machinery parked in corners of Iran while the peasants to whom it was offered have reverted to the old agricultural tools with which they were born. Why? Because, once the machinery was received, Iranian people simply did not have the knowledge either to operate that machinery effectively or the training to give loose nuts and bolts their needed maintenance.

In the nation which we look to as most like ourselves—the British Isles—with a population of 50,000,000, some 60,000 boys and girls will go to college this year. America with a population only 2½ times that of the British Isles will send 35 times as many boys and girls—2,000,000—to college this year though this enrollment will be over a quarter million less than went to college last year.

The real solution to the need for more teachers, more agriculturists, more scientists, more chemists, physicists and engineers, more doctors, more professional and business leaders is to apply to the royalties from the offshore oil our traditional policy of dedicating the revenue from public lands to education.

At the last commencement exercises of Yale University, its new president, Dr. Griswold, in telling of the financial problems of educational institutions as he saw them, said that in his dreams there was "an oil well under Woodbridge Hall." I would say to Dr. Griswold and to all our other educators that they need dream no more of oil wells; that our amendment offers to education oil wealth that is the equivalent of an oil well on the campus of every college, high school and grammar school in America.

The proposal embodied in the oil-for-education amendment is, entirely in accordance with our continuing national tradition of devoting the proceeds of public lands to the support of education. The adoption of this proposal would be a historic act comparable to the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and to the Morrill Act of 1862.

I have been asked the question: "How concretely do you propose to apply these funds to education?"

The answer of the sponsors of this bill is simple, and if I may say so, is eminently practical also. We have said, time and time again, that it is of the utmost importance that we do not get involved in some controversy over how precisely the funds are to be applied until such time as we have first made sure that this priceless asset of \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil is earmarked for the purposes of education. After we have accomplished this, there will be time enough to work out the details of their application.

Our amendment provides that a national council of 12 educators be appointed to study the question of aids for education and to report back to the Congress the results of its study and its recommendations for action by Congress. This council of educators is to consist of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President, 4 by the Speaker of the House, and 4 by the President of the Senate.

The sponsors, drawn from both political parties, view this amendment as a non-partisan attempt to aid education. We have always visualized that the members of the Council must be nonpartisan. Although we did not so include it in our amendment the companion bill in the House introduced by Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana provided that two of each four to be appointed by the President, Speaker and Vice President, shall be Democrats and the other two shall be Republicans. We shall be happy at the proper time to include such a provision in our amendment.

But far more important, at least to the minds of the 18 sponsors of the amendment than the political label which such men may happen to wear, is the quality of the educators to be selected.

It is our thought that they should be selected from such qualified sources as the heads of the great educational foundations; from among the heads of our colleges and universities, large and small, and from the most able men and women in the secondary and elementary fields.

It is a great undertaking that the sponsors of this amendment propose. It is essentially a task to be done for education by educators. They are the men and women who have lived with, and are living with the essential financial problems which beset our schools.

We must bring the best intellects as well as the best informed and most experienced minds to serve on the Council.

Out of a study by the Council undoubtedly will come intelligent and equitable ways to help relieve the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools. And surely sound methods will be found for helping to relieve the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions by techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

Here we are given the opportunity—and this one, I can assure you, really does knock but once—to devote the Nation's wealth under the sea to our children. Such a dream as this "oil for education" proposal can come alive only when we have such a stupendous sum as \$40,000,000,000.

I have mentioned some objectives for study by the National Advisory Council. Actually, if they were to call me before them I would say to them but one thing—and I say it now. I would quote to them the words of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities, the city of Washington. You remember that he said:

"Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood."

Sometimes, Mr. President, we have seen men more frightened by opportunity than by failure. In brief moments of quiet, amidst the struggles and frustrations of daily

problems, we dream of great things that might be. We have our large hopes and our vain imaginings—but they seem so unreal that we are ashamed to speak of them. Instead, we treasure them as little private refuges from life's disappointments.

How often have all of us thus dreamed of some vast bonanza which would give us the bricks and the mortar, the men and the women, the institutions and the instrumentalities to offer our children what they really need.

Then, like Aladdin, we rub the lamp, and the genie is before us tugging to do our will. But, instead of seizing the moment, we hesitate, and the will, enfeebled by the very magnitude of the challenge, quails before success and loses the golden, never-to-be-repeated chance.

Such is the classic history of failure. Let us not fail now. We have rubbed the lamp, and the genie is before us, saying, "Masters, I will build your schoolhouses. Masters, I will give your teachers a living wage. Masters, I will save your colleges. Masters, I will endow you with generations of trained and capable intellects. Masters, I will give you the alchemy of a strong and successful democracy. I am here to serve you."

Our answer must be: "Serve, and serve well."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a short time ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram which I received under date of September 6 from Mr. Irvin R. Kuenzli, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Teachers, in which Mr. Kuenzli advised me of the unanimous endorsement by the federation of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, known as the oil-for-education amendment. The endorsement was given at the annual convention of the federation in Grand Rapids, Mich., last month.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two resolutions of the American Federation of Labor that were adopted at the seventieth annual convention of the federation in San Francisco, Calif., last month.

The resolutions endorse and pledge the full support of the American Federation of Labor to the oil-for-education amendment. Both these resolutions were unanimously adopted by the convention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF INCOME FROM UNDERSEA OIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Whereas Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, one of the greatest educational statesmen our country has produced, has asked that instead of turning submerged oil lands now held by the Federal Government over to the oil interests for exploitation for personal gain at the threatened loss of national security, that the income from this property be turned over expressly for educational use: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor give full support to this proposal to use the income from submerged oil lands to further public education.

OIL LANDS REVENUE FOR EDUCATION

Whereas the security of the United States is imperiled by enemies of our functional democracy; and

Whereas in this situation every American citizen must be rendered capable of contributing his maximum effort in behalf of our

country, and this entails achievement of his highest learning capacity; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that a financial crisis exists in the schools and colleges of this country—a crisis so severe that the quality of American education is seriously endangered and will continue to suffer to an increasing extent unless substantial financial assistance is forthcoming from the Federal Government to help meet this problem of national concern; and

Whereas necessary demands on the Nation's general funds for other important and essential purposes incident to the emergency, indicate the urgency of providing funds from sources in addition to those available through taxation; and

Whereas the House of Representatives had not only failed to provide for such educational needs through tax revenues, but has actually also passed a bill which would remove from the people's use the greatest presently known source of nontax revenue—the returns available from undersea oil; and

Whereas this bill, passed by the House and now before the Senate, would, in effect, surrender this great financial yield to large financial interests that are striving to overrule the United States Supreme Court's decision that the undersea oil belongs to all the 48 States; and

Whereas Senator LISTER HILL, long known to us as a courageous fighter for the rights of American citizens, has sponsored—with the cooperation of other Senators—an amendment to the nefarious House bill which would apply the royalties realized from undersea oil to the support of education—primary, secondary, and higher education: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Labor in annual convention assembled in San Francisco, Calif., That we endorse, and pledge our full support to, the amendment proposed by Senator LISTER HILL which provides that royalties from undersea oil be applied for the support of education in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator LISTER HILL and to Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, with a letter expressing to each of them the appreciation of the American Federation of Labor for their vision and foresight as evidenced by the amendment, and assuring them of the Federation's support in working toward adoption by Congress of their constructive proposals in the public's interest.

RESPONSE BY MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep appreciation for what has been said here this evening in regard to my work. But I desire particularly to join Senators who have expressed their love and admiration for the President of the Senate. He has always been generous in his time to counsel and advise with me. I believe that you, Mr. President, have been most fair to every Member of the Senate.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the staff of the Senate. They have worked with us for many long hours, longer hours than many people know have been spent by them in work.

I express my sincere appreciation to the majority whip, my dear friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who has been a devoted colleague and an energetic worker. Nor should we forget the service of the page boys. And all of us are indebted to the official reporters, whose devotion to duty and long hours at a difficult and thankless task is beyond our ability to praise. In particular I wish to commend Mr. Fred A. Carlson,

one of the Official Reporters, who is ill, and I wish for him a speedy recovery. I desire once again to express my appreciation to all who have helped the Senate in its work. All have contributed toward making this Congress a success.

Earlier in the afternoon we heard a speech by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. He spoke about the time that is needlessly consumed in the Senate.

I believe there are those who feel that I have not consumed as much time as I should have consumed; that I should have responded to various political speeches that have been made from time to time on the floor of the Senate. But I have had the feeling that we had an important legislative duty to perform here, that these are different times that required our undivided attention, and that the record speaks for itself. I have tried to devote what energies I have and what ability I have in an attempt to make the record a little better.

I wish to say just one further word with regard to Government officials, many of whom have been unfairly and perhaps even recklessly criticized.

I picked up Time magazine yesterday evening, and I read an article about the President of the United States. No one can say that Time magazine is partisan to the Democratic Party, or is hesitant to criticize the administration. I shall not read the whole article, but only the first paragraph:

Harry Truman is not an eloquent man. But he is a peace-loving, God-fearing man, who can, on occasion, speak eloquently as the voice of a Nation that is peace-loving and God-fearing, too. This week he did so, when, as a fellow-Baptist, he addressed the ground-breaking ceremonies at the Baptists' new Wake Forest College just outside of Winston-Salem, N. C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine of October 22, 1951]

THE PRESIDENCY—"WE STAND IN NEED"

Harry Truman is not an eloquent man. But he is a peace-loving, God-fearing man who can, on occasion, speak eloquently as the voice of a Nation that is peace-loving and God-fearing, too. This week he did so when, as a fellow Baptist, he addressed the ground-breaking ceremonies at the Baptists' new Wake Forest College just outside of Winston-Salem, N. C.

Said the President of the United States: "I am afraid that some people here and abroad believe that the creation of armed defenses must inevitably lead to war. This is not the case. We do not think war is inevitable." He was willing to consider the difficult question of coexisting with communism, but under conditions that would render world communism powerless to threaten the security of the free world. "So long as one country has the power and forces to overwhelm others, and so long as that country has aggressive intentions, real peace is unattainable. As our strength increases, we should be able to negotiate settlements that the Soviet Union will respect and live up to."

He kept the sharp, political edge from his voice even when he touched briefly, without

naming it, on McCarthyism. "To the sowers of suspicion, and the peddlers of fear, to all those who seem bent in persuading us that our country is on the wrong track and there is no honor or loyalty left in the land I would say one thing: 'Take off your blinders and look toward the future. The worst danger we face is the danger of being paralyzed by doubts and fears. This danger is brought on by those who abandon faith and sneer at hope.' Yet, at heart, I do not greatly fear such men, for they have always been with us, and in the long run they have always failed."

"When the accounts of history are rendered, it is the going forward that will constitute the record—not the hesitations and the mistakes—not how you refrained from wrong, but how you did right. For six long years now we have contended, with all the weapons of mind and spirit, against the adherents of the false god of tyranny. These positive acts have not been easy to do. They have brought upon us the hatred and threats and curses of the enemies of freedom—and may bring upon us even worse troubles. Nevertheless, if this Nation is justified by history, it is these things that will justify it, and not the negative virtue of meaning no harm."

"God forbid that I should claim for our country the mantle of perfect righteousness. We have committed sins of omission and sins of commission, for which we stand in need of the mercy of the Lord. But I dare maintain before the world that we have done much that was right."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the article singing the praises of the President of the United States described him as speaking for a God-fearing and God-loving people. Regardless of whether we agree with the President, that is the kind of President we have.

With respect to some of the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, I think I should say there always will be, regardless of what administration or what party may be in control some Government employees who are not trustworthy. In any group of a million or more people, there are some lacking in some respects. None of us is perfect. Yet, the percentage of those in Government unworthy of trust is amazingly small; on the whole they are just what Time described the mass of the people of the United States—God-loving and God-fearing people.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to say something about the record of this session of the Congress. However, I do not care to take the time of the Senate to do so at this time. Therefore, I am placing in a subsequent edition of the RECORD an analysis of what I think this session of Congress has accomplished.

I think I should say, however, that I am proud that I serve in the Senate of the United States, and that I am a Member of the Eighty-second Congress. Those of us who serve here represent the Government which is the best in the world. It is demonstrated to be the best because the largest numbers of persons who seek entrance into our country come from the countries which criticize us the most. We who serve in the Senate are Members of the greatest deliber-

ative body in the world. I am proud of the record the Senate has made during this session of the Congress. I wish to express my appreciation to Senators on both sides of the aisle for helping to make the record we have made.

This Congress will go down in history as a national-defense Congress. This Congress has done more than has any so-called peacetime Congress—that is outside a period of global war—for the defense of the United States of America.

This Congress has devoted itself almost unstintingly to authorizations and appropriations designed to build up our strength as a bulwark for the whole world against aggressive communism. In so doing, I believe this Congress has done more to bring about eventual peace in a troubled world.

Mr. President, as we adjourn this evening, my feeling is a mixture of joy and sadness: joy because I shall be returning home to visit again with my friends and neighbors in my State and discuss with them our problems; sadness because I shall miss my colleagues and associations here, even though I shall be gone for only 2 months.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in behalf of the 250,000 American boys fighting in Korea and in behalf of the 85,000 to 95,000 American boys who have been casualties in Korea, I feel that as one Member of the United States Senate I should say that I do not believe we are at peace, and I do not think this session of Congress has been a peacetime session. To the contrary, we have been appropriating money and we have been doing many other things in the national defense effort, in order to protect those who are fighting for us in Korea and who are giving their utmost to win the Korean war. In their behalf, and as one Member of the United States Senate, I do not want them to receive the impression that we think the Nation is at peace and that we are neglecting them and that we think we are not at war, because we are at war.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish at this time to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the Korean conflict. No one feels more deeply than do I about our American boys who have shed their blood in Korea, fighting under the flag of the United Nations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was stating my view.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, your committee appointed to wait upon the President and inform him that the Congress is ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make, has performed that duty, and the President has advised us that he has no further communication to make to Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Therefore, Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 171, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, the Vice President, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 172, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacquelyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo;

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin;

H. R. 320. An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H. R. 3490. An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3590. An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property;

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H. R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, and maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4055. An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger;

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5745. An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages;

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 22, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacquelyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed acts, as follows:

On October 22, 1951:

S. 1959. An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1951:

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota.

On October 24, 1951:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathay Dana Besser;

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; and

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel.

On October 26, 1951:

S. 210. An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Reselleen Schut; and

S. 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

On October 29, 1951:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacquelyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates;

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; and

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo.

On October 30, 1951:

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates;
S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1881, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin; and

S. 2233. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

On October 31, 1951:

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947;

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes; and

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes.

DISAPPROVAL OF SENATE BILL AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that on October 31, 1951, the President had vetoed the bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received October 20 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Gen. Mark W. Clark, Army of the United States, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the state of Vatican City.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

John Thomas Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Gurley C. Pitts, Altus.
Joe G. Hornberger, Manila.

CALIFORNIA

Norman R. Brown, Arroyo Grande.
Geraldine J. Joiner, Adin.
Martha E. DeVilbiss, Big Bear City.

Karl W. Traylor, Blairsden.
Ella Kaye Curran, Bostonia.
Wyvonne E. Ingram, Brisbane.
Clifford A. Ham, Colton.
Oliver A. Thorson, Darwin.
Winston S. Oaks, Lakeside.
Richard E. Beechly, Lamont.
Bernard T. Finnin, Mojave.
Marshall G. Winn, Philo.
George M. Gallagher, Point Reyes Station.
Worth Keene, Seal Beach.
Marvin H. Moest, Warner Springs.

FLORIDA

Madge K. Casey, Gulf Hammock.

HAWAII

Louis J. DeCotte, Keahua.

IDAHO

Elsie E. Moore, Donnelly.
Lloyd J. Passey, Paris.

INDIANA

Wilson Flack, Vernon.

MARYLAND

Homer C. Shaffer, Crellin.

MICHIGAN

William J. McGill, Davison.
Ruth A. Howe, Houghton Point.
Kenneth R. Ruthig, Minden City.
Leland S. Jennings, Saginaw.
Evelyn M. Evans, St. Joseph.

MISSISSIPPI

Julian B. Gardner, Columbus.
Leonard C. Gibson, Jr., Crawford.
Nathan A. Riley, Dorsey.

MISSOURI

Dixie E. Myers, Green Ridge.
Warren H. Feldman, Stanberry.
John W. Nelson, Versailles.

NEW JERSEY

Robert J. Noce, Englishtown.
Clifford C. Emens, Monmouth Junction.
George T. Knapp, Mullica Hill.
Edith M. Jackson, Princeton Junction.

OHIO

Paul A. Miller, Jackson.
Walter G. Sawyer, Lockbourne.
Walter E. Bennett, Okeana.

PENNSYLVANIA

Helen M. Smith, Blairsville.
John William Strayer, Dover.
Andrew W. Kovach, Grindstone.
Charles F. Gregory, Lake Winola.
Frank H. Keller, Linden.
Sarah V. Webster, Sewickley.
Brace S. Knabenshue, Warren.

and for which we are contending, cannot be secured and maintained by our own human wisdom and might but by Thy spirit pervading and sustaining our individual and national life.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow upon our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all who have served in various capacities, the seal of Thy approval and Thy fatherly benediction. May we have within our minds and hearts the testimony that we have sought to fulfill the duties of our high vocation with a pure and steadfast devotion to Thee and our fellow men.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace. Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, announced that on the following dates the President had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 10, 1951:

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Vladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Vladimir Lewicki;

H. R. 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham;

H. R. 2562. An act amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3026. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari; and

H. R. 3123. An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico.

On October 11, 1951:

H. R. 676. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 1203. An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovsch (also known as Hanoh Charat, Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovsch (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovsch;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4496. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4756. An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers;

H. R. 5013. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea;

H. R. 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense-production plants in such area; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

On October 12, 1951:

H. R. 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1951

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who art always manifesting Thy grace and loving kindness, grant that we may be truly grateful for the many material and spiritual blessings which Thou hast vouchsafed unto us during this session of Congress.

Help us to continue to covet and cultivate more earnestly the durable satisfactions of life. God forbid that we should ever misdirect our aspirations and energies by putting the emphasis in the wrong places and on the wrong things.

May we understand that the peace and freedom, which we prize so highly,